School of Theology at Claremont
1001 1346632

The Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT

WEST FOOTHILL AT COLLEGE AVENUE
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA

A MANUAL OF THEOLOGY

NOTICES OF EARLIER THEOLOGICAL WORKS BY THE SAME AUTHOR

The Guardian.

"It is in the treatment of the doctrine of the Person of Christ that Dr. Beet reaches, as we think, his highest level, and fans the hope into a brighter flame that a confession of Christ's Deity may be a rallying-point for disunited Christendom. The chapter on "Subordinatio Filii," or, as Newman preferred to call it, "Principatus Patris," is a fine example of the best style of theological writing, and the writer has not failed to warn the student, who cannot be warned of it too often, that human terms and conceptions are necessarily inadequate for the description of divine realities. . . . Dr. Beet may safely reckon upon a welcome for his remaining volumes, if he should maintain the high standard of fidelity and excellence set up in this first part of his comprehensive undertaking."

The Church Quarterly Review.

"No Catholic can fail to rejoice that Jesus Christ, our Lord and theirs, should be preached with so much industry and such devout loyalty."

The London Quarterly Review.

"The two volumes are therefore companion volumes, which every devout reader will study with growing delight and profit. The limpid style, the clear and well-ordered marshalling of arguments, and the fresh light thrown on all points which are discussed, are conspicuous here as in all Dr. Beet's writings. He has the rare faculty of making his subject so luminous that he carries his readers forward with him, step by step."

The Dublin Review (*Roman Catholic Quarterly*).

"We are so accustomed to translations from the German that it is quite refreshing to notice the work of a genuine English scholar, and to find that, without being inferior in learning, it surpasses foreign works in clearness and method."

The Scotsman.

"The volume is one of conspicuous merit. It is the production of a strong man well equipped for the work he has set himself to do."

T
5
4

A MANUAL OF THEOLOGY

BY

JOSEPH AGAR BEET, D.D.

HODDER AND STOUGHTON

LONDON, MCMVI

Theology Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

"Let us begin by asking whether all this which they call the universe is left to the guidance of unreason and chance medley, or on the contrary, as our fathers have declared, is ordered and governed by a marvellous intelligence and wisdom."—PLATO.

"Thou hast made us for Thyself; and restless is our heart till it finds rest in Thee."—AUGUSTINE.

"This must be our notion of the just man, that, even when he is in poverty or sickness or any other seeming misfortune, to him these things will turn out in the end for good, living or even dead. For by the gods he is cared for, whoever he be, that eagerly wishes to become righteous and by practising virtue to become like God so far as this is possible to man."—PLATO.

"Give what Thou bidst: and bid what Thou wilt."—AUGUSTINE.

"I shrank not from declaring to you the whole counsel of God."—PAUL to the elders of the Church at Ephesus.

PREFACE

THIS volume embodies an attempt to gain, so far as the limitations of human knowledge permit, a connected and comprehensive view, in their objective reality, of the unseen foundations of religion. Our sources of information are found in the material universe, which bears witness to the intelligence and resources of its Author; in the intuitions and experiences of our own inner life, in which we hear His voice and trace His work; in the visible life of men around, with its moral lessons; and in the inner and outer life of men in all ages, as expressed and recorded in the literature of the world. Comparison with other teachers and religions, will reveal the surpassing greatness of One supreme Teacher, whose influence has turned back the whole course of human life from the ruin into which, in His day, it was hopelessly sinking, into a new path of sustained progress. His teaching we shall hear re-echoed, and His face we shall see portrayed, in the writings of His earliest disciples. Henceforth our theological research will become, in great part, an effort to reproduce and understand this teaching in its historic reality, and to grasp His hand stretched out to save. Taught by Him, we shall gain a conception of the Unseen resting on

a foundation which our intelligence will recognise as immovable, and commending itself to all that in us is best.

As in Natural Science, so in Theology, the results gained will evoke questions more difficult than those they answer. For human life and thought are surrounded on all sides by an infinite Unknown. Hence the incompleteness of the answers given. Nevertheless, man's persistent efforts to push forward the frontier of knowledge step by step, and thus to win for himself the Known from the Unknown, have greatly enriched and ennobled him. The widening empire of the things that are known is man's greatest triumph.

From the above, appears the aim and worth of Theology. It is an effort to learn that which is most worth knowing. "This is the eternal life, that they may know Thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent." Each nearer and clearer view of the unseen brings us into closer personal contact, through Christ, with a Father in heaven; and thus enriches and strengthens the life immortal which He has given to His children. Moreover, the knowledge we gain for ourselves, we are enabled to impart to others, and thus to guide them into the school of Christ. Theology is thus a needful armament of all who endeavour to save the lost, to educate the young, and to build up the Church. Once more: a wider and deeper knowledge of things divine affords to the divided family of God the best hope of reunion and of more effective co-operation. For the most serious barriers between Christians are discordant and conflicting theological opinions sincerely held by good men. The discord proves that there is error somewhere, probably on all

sides: and this can be removed only by discovery of the truth. Already theologians are in much closer accord than are the traditional beliefs of the Churches. As servants of Him who said, "I am the Truth," our loyalty binds us to do all we can to bring our conceptions of the unseen, even at the cost of surrender of cherished beliefs, into closest and widest possible agreement with the eternal realities.

This search for theological truth is surrounded by great difficulties. Serious errors have sometimes become endeared to us by their association with doctrines which have been verified as true by their uplifting moral influence to ourselves and others. Thus is our judgment warped in their favour. Moreover, most theologians are bound by strong material interests, by cords of silk or chains of iron, as official teachers, to the traditional beliefs of their own communion. Meanwhile, the spread of intelligence and culture and a more thorough study of the Bible have, during many years, modified all traditional beliefs, to the great profit of many and to the alarm of others. Under these circumstances those most fit to guide are tempted to be silent, leaving others to suppose that they still hold opinions which in their hearts they have long ago abandoned, and thus avoiding consequences serious to themselves. Their silence deprives the Church of the best thoughts of its best thinkers. Other evil results follow. To the more intelligent inquirers, the real significance of this silence is soon apparent. Sincere and devout men discover, to their dismay, that some doctrines they have been taught are not held by those who know most about them. In perplexity they ask, How many

other doctrines are there, commonly received, but silently repudiated by our best theologians?

This reticence is most unworthy. The great apostle said, "I shrank not from declaring to you the whole counsel of God." The recognised teachers of the Church are bound, in this age of transition, to state plainly and without reserve, in suitable ways and on suitable occasions, to all sincere inquirers, their real convictions or doubts about matters in dispute. That He might bear witness to the truth, the great Teacher gave up His life: and the cross He bore, He lays, as His easy yoke, on all who have learnt the truth from Him.

The present work is a growth of many years. The principles underlying it found expression in my *Commentary on Romans*, published in 1877; and in my later works on the other epistles of Paul. An outline of my argument was given in my Fernley Lecture on *The Credentials of the Gospel* in 1889, of which the concluding paragraph is reprinted as an appropriate close of this volume. The present work was in part anticipated in three volumes entitled *Through Christ to God*, *The New Life in Christ*, and *The Last Things*, published and republished still more recently. All these and much more, carefully revised and condensed, are republished in this one volume in order to give in small compass a connected view of theology as a whole.

Among topics discussed here which deserve more attention than they have yet received, I may mention (see §§ 10ff, 136ff) the inborn MORAL SENSE or CONSCIENCE of man, an all-important factor in religion and in theology; the

changed place (see ch. 8) of the BIBLE in English thought and scholarship during the last fifty years, involving a complete change in theological method and affording a much broader and firmer foundation for intelligent Christian certainty; and (see chs. 32–34) an exposition of HOLINESS which finds in the O.T. ritual, read in the light of the N.T., a new ideal of Christian excellence as unreserved devotion to God, and indeed (see § 84) an all-important yet forgotten element in the nature of God.

The comparatively large space given to Eschatology accords with its large place in the N.T. and with its infinite importance. The attempt in some quarters to pass in silence over this great topic, which underlies all religion and moulds our conception of God, is both vain and hurtful. The time has come to acknowledge that we are no longer able to assert that which our fathers asserted with complete confidence; and to state plainly how we interpret the teaching of the N.T. on this solemn matter in everyone's thought.

The argument of this volume is not affected by questions about the authorship and date of the Books of the Bible except so far as I have indicated in chs. 5–9. It has therefore not been needful to refer frequently to modern O.T. scholarship. Indisputably the O.T. as we now possess it in Hebrew and Greek presents the past history of the nation as it was understood by the writers of the N.T.; and sufficiently explains the significance they gave to the Old Covenant, and frequently the meaning of the words they used.

My method involves occasional overlapping. Again and again I have been compelled to review the ground already

traversed, in order to survey, from different points of view, the new position gained. In this I have set a good example. A secret of successful research is unwearied retracing of ground already trodden. The richest harvest is often found in the latest gleanings.

It may be objected that some of my chapters are little more than a string of references to the Bible. So may counsel for the defence complain that the judge's summing up is a mere quotation of assertions already made. In each case it is needful to restate the evidence in small compass in order that those before whom it is put may feel its cumulative force. My references to the Bible will be of value chiefly so far as they recall independent study of the passages referred to. Narrowness of space made needful this compact way of stating the evidence on which my conclusions rest. In all the more important matters, the significance of the evidence adduced is fully discussed. Moreover, I have nowhere assumed the infallibility of the Bible, but have tested its chief statements by strictly historical methods; *e.g.* ch. 25 as compared with ch. 24, and ch. 27 with ch. 26, also §§ 102–105.

It will be noticed that throughout this volume Apologetics and Exposition are intertwined, *i.e.* that, as in Natural Science, each step forward rests on evidence adduced. The separate treatment of Apologetics, except for fuller treatment of details, belongs to the time when a system of theology was built on a theory of the inerrancy of the Bible.

Of modern manuals of theology, the most able and outspoken and stimulating known to me is Dr. W. N. Clarke's *Outline of Theology*: T. & T. Clark. Naturally, in a work

so independent there are points which I cannot accept. Moreover, I notice that nothing is said about the Pastorate, Baptism, and the Lord's Supper; and very little about the Church. These omissions are serious defects in this useful and attractive volume. But no one can accompany Dr. Clarke through these pages and the sacred topics therein discussed without great profit.

And now, to my fellow-pupils in the school of Christ, I commit this work embodying the thought and laborious research of many years, with deep gratitude that God has permitted me to accomplish this long-cherished purpose and to lay this small tribute—His gift to me, not mine to Him—on the altar of Christ.

11, Dynevor Road, Richmond, Surrey.

August, 1906.

CONTENTS

PART I

NATURE AND GOD

CHAP.		PAGE
I.	The Visible reveals a Greater Invisible beyond	3
II.	The Moral Sense of Man	9
III.	Retribution beyond the Grave	14

PART II

CHRISTIANITY AND CHRIST

IV.	Contrast of Christian and non-Christian Nations	21

PART III

THE SACRED RECORDS

V.	The New Testament: Authorship and Date	31
VI.	,, ,, ,, its Truth and Worth	43
VII.	The Old Testament: its Contents, Truth, and Worth	51
VIII.	The Authority of the Bible	63
IX.	Suggestions for Study	68

PART IV

THE FATHER, SON, AND SPIRIT

X.	God, our Father	77
XI.	The Son of God: His Superhuman Dignity	83

CHAP.		PAGE
XII.	The Son's Relation to the Father	87
XIII.	The Incarnation of the Son	101
XIV.	The Spirit of God	107
XV.	The Eternal Three in One. The Nicene Creed	113
XVI.	Angels, Good and Bad	123

PART V

MAN: CREATED AND RUINED

XVII.	Created, and under Probation	131
XVIII.	Sin and Bondage	138
XIX.	The First Fall and its Results	142

PART VI

THE GOSPEL OF PARDON

XX.	The Law	151
XXI.	The Moral Teaching of Christ	155
XXII.	The Pardon of Sins, through Faith	158
XXIII.	The Nature of Faith. Faith and Works	169

PART VII

THROUGH CHRIST JESUS

XXIV.	The Cross of Christ	181
XXV.	The Rationale of the Atonement	192
XXVI.	Christ is Risen	204
XXVII.	Proof that He actually rose	208
XXVIII.	Objections	218

PART VIII

THE NEW LIFE IN CHRIST

XXIX.	Adoption	231
XXX.	Assurance of Salvation	238
XXXI.	The New Birth	244

CHAP.		PAGE
XXXII.	The Way of Holiness	249
XXXIII.	The New Life of Devotion to Christ	261
XXXIV.	Sanctification in the Spirit, and through Faith	266
XXXV.	In Christ all Things are New	274
XXXVI.	Conflict and Growth	289
XXXVII.	The Means of Grace. Prayer	297

PART IX

THE DIVINE-HUMAN CHRISTIAN LIFE

XXXVIII.	The Eternal Purpose	309
XXXIX.	Human Freedom	316
XL.	God and Man	322
XLI.	Results Attained	332

PART X

THE CHURCH OF CHRIST

XLII.	The Temple and the Synagogue	337
XLIII.	The Church, Actual and Ideal	340
XLIV.	The Christian Pastorate	350
XLV.	The Pastorate: Early Christian Writers	357
XLVI.	Modern Churches	363
XLVII.	The Lord's Supper: in the New Testament	380
XLVIII.	,, ,, ,, Modern Opinions	390
XLIX.	On Baptism	396
L.	The Baptism of Infants	401
LI.	Baptismal Regeneration. The Sacraments	413
LII.	The Lord's Day and the Jewish Sabbath	421
LIII.	,, ,, ,, its Permanent Validity	428

PART XI

THE LAST THINGS

LIV.	Retribution beyond the Grave, continued from ch. III	441

CHAP.		PAGE
LV.	STATE OF THE DEPARTED	449
LVI.	THE SECOND COMING OF CHRIST: EARLIER TEACHING	452
LVII.	,, ,, ,, ,, THE NEW TESTAMENT	458
LVIII.	MILLENNARIANISM	477
LIX.	SPIRITUAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE SECOND COMING	485
LX.	THE DOOM OF THE LOST	492
LXI.	,, ,, ,, ,, CONTINUED	505
LXII.	THE IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL	517
LXIII.	THEORIES OF THE DOOM OF THE LOST	525
LXIV.	PRACTICAL VALUE OF THIS TEACHING	536
LXV.	THE CITY OF GOD	539
LXVI.	SUMMARY OF RESULTS: THEIR RELATION TO OTHER BRANCHES OF KNOWLEDGE	547

PART I

NATURE AND GOD

CHAPTER I

THE VISIBLE REVEALS A GREATER INVISIBLE BEYOND

1. THE first object which attracts the thought of man is the VISIBLE WORLD around consisting of objects lifeless and living and rational in endless variety, many of them clothed in a beauty which enchants, and others revealing an adaptation to useful ends which evokes our highest admiration. Wherever we look, we see objects which promise to repay abundantly our most careful study.

2. The complexity and constant change of the universe suggest very strongly, or compel us to believe, that it is not self-existent, but DERIVED. We therefore ask eagerly, Whence came this wonderful panorama which fills us with delight?

This question evokes another. Amid natural objects which no human hand has made, we notice the works of man. Of these, all the best are products of careful THOUGHT as well as of patient toil: and in every case the worker is immensely greater than his best work. We ask therefore, Is the material universe an exception to this universal generalisation? Does it reveal the hand of a Worker as much greater than man as the universe surpasses the noblest works of man, or is it only a result of the operation of blind and unconscious forces? If the latter, man's study

of nature, so elevating to whatever in him is noblest and best, is but a contemplation of something infinitely inferior to himself.

Against this suggestion, every instinct of our nature rebels. The splendour of nature, surpassing all that man can make and prompting his own best thoughts and works, proclaims that behind and above the material world is a Worker as much above Nature as the artist is greater than his picture and as much above man as the vast and glorious universe is greater than the noblest works of man. The edifice bears witness to the skill and resources of its Architect.

This testimony is not weakened by the fact that the DEVELOPMENT of living objects is going on before our eyes, and can in some measure be explained by the operation of known and constant forces. For our wonder at a manufactured article is not lessened when we see the automatic machine by which it was made. We ask at once, Who made the machine? and we wonder at his skill. The theologian asks, Whence came the natural forces which produced the beautiful world around us? Who or what gave them their original impulse, and directed the mode of their operation? To these questions, Nature's only answer is that the Maker must be greater than all that He has made.

3. This inference is confirmed by other facts recently observed. The rocks beneath our feet attest that our planet was not always as it is now, that animals existed long before man, that the lower forms of animal life are earlier than the higher, and that our planet was once destitute of even the lowest forms of life. In other words, the conspicuous divisions of LIFELESS, LIVING, and RATIONAL mark off in their appearance three great epochs in the history of our globe.

Moreover, so far as has yet been observed, all LIFE is

derived FROM pre-existing LIFE. And the known forces of nature are altogether inadequate either to produce out of inorganic matter the mysterious chemical compounds which make up living bodies, or to form them into organic cells, or to endow them with the functions of life. In other words, in the observed order of the universe, the forces of nature never bridge over the interval between the lifeless and the living; and seem utterly incapable of doing so. But indisputably that interval has been bridged. And the presence of life now in what was once a lifeless world reveals unmistakably a Power infinitely greater than the forces observed in nature.

4. All this is further confirmed by the phenomena of MIND. For intelligence, so vastly superior to its material environment, cannot be explained by the operation of unconscious forces. It bears witness to the intelligence of its source: see § 311.

5. Moreover the forces of nature cannot explain THEIR OWN ORIGIN. Although gravitation, for instance, is in its operation so well known, none can tell us why a stone falls to the ground, and why it falls sixteen feet in the first second. These questions elude utterly all scientific research, which only tabulates phenomena in their co-existence and sequence, and does nothing to trace them to their ultimate source. Nor can natural forces explain the origin of motion. For the forces inherent in matter, *e.g.* gravitation and chemical affinity, tend always towards equilibrium. The various movements in the world to-day reveal some primal impulse in a direction different from that of the inherent forces. This impulse cannot be accounted for by any of the known forces operating now; and therefore, like the universe itself with its inherent forces, and like the origin of life, reveals the operation of a higher power. For the further theological significance of the above, see §§ 232ff, 339f.

6. Our study of the material universe leads us a step further. From the manifest UNITY of Nature and the harmony of all natural forces, we infer with confidence that its Source, which must be higher than the highest derived from it, is ONE.

7. Once more. While we contemplate the beauty of the universe, the wonderful adaptation of its parts, their exhaustless variety, and their profound unity, the eye which contemplates gains immensely in clearness and penetration and width of view. The visible world is a great lesson book spread out before us: and the value of the lesson reveals the presence of a TEACHER infinitely wise. Man's own thoughts about Nature suggest irresistibly that it is itself a realisation of still higher thought. In other words, the effect of Nature on man's intelligence confirms our previous inference that its Author is Himself intelligent.

8. That the world is neither self-existent nor a product of blind force, but is a work of self-existent Intelligence, was recognised by all the more cultured nations of antiquity.

So PLATO, *Timæus* p. 28. "Was the heaven then and the world . . . always in existence and without beginning? or created and having a beginning? Created, I reply, being visible and tangible and having a body, and therefore perceived by the senses; and sensible things which are apprehended by opinion and sense manifestly come into being and are begotten. Now that which is made must of necessity be made by a cause. But how can we find out the Maker and Father of all this universe? And, when we have found Him, to speak of His nature to all men, is impossible. Yet one more question has to be asked about Him, Which of the patterns had the Artificer in view when He made the world, the pattern which is unchangeable or that which is made? If the world be indeed fair and the Artificer good, then as is plain He must have looked to that which is eternal. But

if what cannot be said without blasphemy be true, then He looked to the created pattern. Every one will see that He must have looked to the eternal: for the world is the fairest of the things which have begun to be; and He is the Best of causes."

So on pp. 29, 30. "Let me tell you why the Creator created and made the universe. He was good: and no goodness can ever have jealousy of anything. And, being free from jealousy, He desired that all things should be as like Himself as possible. This is the true beginning of creation and of the world, as we shall do well in believing on the testimony of wise men. God desired that all things should be good and nothing bad, in so far as this could be accomplished. Wherefore also finding the whole visible sphere not at rest, but moving in an irregular and disorderly manner, out of disorder He brought order, considering that this was far better than the other. Now the deeds of Him who is the best can never be or have been other than the fairest: and the Creator, reflecting on the visible work of nature, found that no unintelligent creature taken as a whole was fairer than the intelligent taken as a whole; and that intelligence could not exist in anything devoid of soul (*i.e.* of life). For these reasons, He put intelligence in soul, and soul in body, and framed the universe to be the best and fairest work in the order of nature. And therefore, using the language of probability, we may say that the world became a living soul and truly rational through the providence of God."

9. So CICERO, *Nature of the Gods* bk. 2^2. "What can be so plain and evident, when we behold the heavens and contemplate the celestial bodies, as the existence of some supreme, divine Intelligence, by which all these things are governed? Were it otherwise, Ennius would not, with

universal approbation, have said, 'Look up to the refulgent heaven above, which all men call unanimously Jove.' This is Jupiter, the governor of the world, who rules all things with his rod, and is, as the same Ennius says, 'Father of gods and men,' an omnipresent and omnipotent God. And if any one doubts this, I really do not understand why the same man may not also doubt whether there is a sun or not. For what can possibly be more evident than this? And if it were not a truth universally impressed on the minds of men, the belief in it would never have been so firm; nor would it have been, as it is, increased by length of years, nor would it have gathered strength and stability through every age. And in truth we see that other opinions, being false and groundless, have already fallen into oblivion by lapse of time. Who now believes in Hippocentaurs and Chimeras? Or what old woman is now to be found so weak and ignorant as to stand in fear of those infernal monsters which once so terrified mankind? For time destroys the fictions of error and opinion, while it confirms the determinations of nature and of truth. And therefore it is that, both among us and among other nations, sacred institutions and the worship of the gods have been strengthened and improved from time to time."

Also § 6, where Chrysippus the Stoic is quoted as saying, "If there is anything in the universe which no human reason, ability, or power can make, the being who produced it must certainly be better than man. Now celestial bodies, and all those things which proceed in any eternal order, cannot be made by man. The being who made them is therefore better than man. What then is that being but God? For if there are no gods, what can be in the nature of things better than man? For, in him alone is reason, than which nothing can be more excellent. But it is a foolish arrogance for man

to reckon that there is nothing better than himself. There is therefore something better: there is therefore certainly a God."

CHAPTER II

THE MORAL SENSE OF MAN

10. WE frequently find ourselves pronouncing on the conduct and character of our fellows and of ourselves, a JUDGMENT differing in kind from all other judgments. This difference is illustrated by the different emotions evoked by a great calamity and a great crime. The one we deplore; the other we condemn. And the condemnation thus pronounced, and our approval of noble actions, occupy a place of unique superiority to all other judgments pronounced by men.

These judgments and the moral principles underlying them are only to a small extent under OUR OWN CONTROL. For we cannot change them at will; but are compelled, like judges in our courts of law, to pronounce sentence according to principles already laid down. Our own condemnation or approval, we feel to be the voice of an AUTHORITY infinitely higher than ourselves.

11. These judgments are frequently pronounced with a CERTAINTY which tolerates no appeal. In spite of many mistakes in cases lying between the extremes of right and wrong, we pronounce at once, in all extreme cases, what we know to be a just judgment. Moreover, in its main outlines, this authoritative standard is the same in ALL AGES AND NATIONS. The same types of character elicit everywhere and always the

same admiration and condemnation. Men know everywhere that treachery, lying, theft, adultery, dishonour to parents, and murder are condemned by a law which speaks with an unerring voice of indisputable authority.

12. We now ask, Whence comes this standard of judgment so far beyond our control, so widespread, and so decisive? Not from human LEGISLATION. For there has been no such universal legislation. And all legislators know that their laws must conform to a higher standard, that they need confirmation by a Judge enthroned in every heart. Not unfrequently we give highest praise to one who has set at nought human laws in obedience to a loftier authority. Evidently our sense of right and wrong is no mere transcript of human legislation.

Nor can it be explained by our observation of the good and bad CONSEQUENCES of certain lines of action. For, if so, we should give highest praise to him who was so clever as to escape punishment. Yet every one of us would condemn and despise a man who made this his aim in life. Doubtless these observed sequences strengthen our moral judgments. But the majesty of the moral sense and the authority of the sentence we pronounce on sin, frequently without thought of its results, prove decisively that they are not the only or chief source and ground of our judgments.

Thus fail utterly all attempts to explain, by the facts of the material world, the facts of the moral sense. Yet these last come daily under our immediate observation, and are as certain as are those of the material world, and much more important. The standard which determines our moral judgments and the authority which maintains it elude the grasp of mere students of Natural Science and of the social life of men. But no theory of the universe is worth a moment's attention if it fail to give some account of this unique authority which controls the entire life and thought of men. And,

since no explanation of it can be found in the material world, we must seek one in the realm of the Unseen.

13. Notice now THREE groups of PHENOMENA which cannot be explained by anything within the immediate observation of man, and which thus reveal a Power vastly superior to all natural forces: (1) the material universe itself with the various forces inherent in matter or acting on matter, (2) the origin of life, (3) the moral judgments of men. These phenomena are most closely related. The material world is the arena of vegetable and animal life and of the intellectual and moral life of men: and only as stages leading up to this higher life have the lower forms of life and the material world real worth. This close connection suggests irresistibly that these three unexplained phenomena have one invisible source.

Moreover, just as the unreasoning material world evokes and develops human intelligence, thus attesting the intelligence of its Author, so man's daily conflict with nature, forced upon him by his material constitution, gives scope for and DEVELOPS the highest MORAL QUALITIES and thus gives to human life a nobility it could not otherwise have. The benefit of this discipline, which outweighs far the degrading tendency of the burdens of life, bears witness to the moral purpose of the Author of the universe. This evidence is found only in the inner life of men; and is not appreciated by all. But to many in all ages the felt moral helpfulness of even the hardships of life has been decisive proof that the material world is the work of Him whose voice of authority they have heard in their own moral sense.

Further, man is so constituted in mind and body and so placed that in the long run right and wrong doing bring respectively happiness and misery. These widely observed sequences are, as we have seen, insufficient to account for

the origin of the moral sense. But, that the material constitution of the world brings good to those who obey the dictates of the moral sense, is additional proof that this last and the material universe have one source and that this SOURCE is both INTELLIGENT AND MORAL.

14. These results of our own observation receive remarkable confirmation from the literature of the ancient world.

So SOPHOCLES, *Antigoné* 449ff. "And didst thou dare to transgress that law? Yes: for it was not Zeus that published me that edict; not such are the laws set among men by the Justice who dwells with the gods below (*i.e.* ruling the dead); nor deemed I that the decrees were of such force that a mortal could override the unwritten and unfailing statutes of heaven. For their life is not of to-day or yesterday, but from all time, and no man knows when they were first put forth. Not through dread of any human pride could I answer (*i.e.* pay penalty) to the gods for breaking these."

Cp. XENOPHON, *Memoirs of Socrates* bk. iv. 4^{19-21}. "Dost thou know, said he, Hippias, any unwritten laws? Those in every country, said he, held binding touching the same things. Wouldst thou then be able to say, said he, that men made them? Why, how, said he, could all men come together when they do not speak the same language? Then who do you suppose, said he, has made these laws? I think, said he, that gods gave these laws to men. For, with all men, it is thought right first of all to reverence gods. Is it then everywhere thought right to honour parents? It is, said he. Also that parents and children do not marry? To me, Socrates, this does not seem to be a law of God. Why? said he. Because I see some, said he, transgressing it. Yes; and many other things they do against law. But then they who transgress the laws made by the gods pay a penalty which in no way man can escape; just as some who

transgress laws made by men escape punishment secretly or by violence."

So DEMOSTHENES, *On the Crown* p. 317. "Not only will these principles be found in the enactments of the law, but even nature herself has laid them down in her unwritten laws and in the moral constitutions of men."

15. Also CICERO, *Laws* bk. 2^4. "This then, as it appears to me, has been the decision of the wisest philosophers, that law was neither a thing contrived by the genius of man, nor established by any decree of the people, but a certain eternal principle which governs the entire universe, wisely commanding what is right and forbidding what is wrong. Therefore they called that primal and supreme law the mind of God enjoining or forbidding each separate thing in accordance with reason. On which account it is that this law, which the gods have bestowed on the human race, is so justly praised. For it is the reason and mind of a wise Being equally able to urge us to good and to deter us from evil. . . . For even Tarquin had the light of reason deduced from the nature of things, which incites to good actions and dissuades from evil ones; and which does not begin for the first time to be a law when it is drawn up in writing, but from the first moment that it exists: and its existence is coeval with the divine mind. Therefore the true and supreme law, whose commands and prohibitions are equally authoritative, is the right reason of the Sovereign Jupiter."

16. With these pre-Christian writers, compare PAUL, Rom. $2^{14, 15}$. Also BUTLER, *On Human Nature* $2^{10, 11}$. "There is a superior principle of reflection or conscience in every man, which distinguishes between the internal principles of his heart, as well as his external actions: which passes judgment upon himself and them; pronounces determinately some actions to be in themselves just, right, good; others

to be in themselves evil, wrong, unjust: which, without being consulted, without being advised with, magisterially exerts itself, and approves or condemns him the doer of them accordingly: and which, if not forcibly stopped, naturally and always and of course goes on to anticipate a higher and more effectual sentence, which shall hereafter second and affirm its own. . . . It is by this faculty, natural to man, that he is a moral agent, that he is a law to himself: by this faculty, I say, not to be considered merely as a principle in his heart, which is to have some influence as well as others; but considered as a faculty in kind and in nature supreme over all others, and which bears its own authority of being so."

On the immense importance of the moral sense as a factor in religion, see further in §§ 136–141.

CHAPTER III

RETRIBUTION BEYOND THE GRAVE

17. WE notice in ourselves that disobedience to the moral sense is always followed by MORAL DETERIORATION, by loss of moral strength, and consequently by loss of self-respect: and this immediate result awakens a fear that further evil results will follow. The majesty of the moral law, which secures at once the reverence of whatever in us is noblest and best, compels us to believe that it is able to vindicate its commands by due punishment and reward; that sin and sorrow, righteousness and well-being, are linked together by ties which none can break.

This expectation of reward and punishment is strengthened by our observation of various outward consequences which usually follow right and wrong doing. The immediate inward degradation finds an outward counterpart in the bad effects of sin on society, which often fall, sometimes with crushing force, by the outworking of influences which none can hinder, upon the head of the sinner. This outward retribution is approved, and indeed demanded, by the moral sense. Where it is, we feel that moral order is maintained: where it is not, that order seems to be disturbed.

We notice also that, in the present life, this RETRIBUTION is IRREGULAR: that, although the moral sense demands in every case due reward and punishment, very frequently the wicked prosper, and not a few have lost even life itself by doing right. This irregularity has in all ages puzzled the wisest of men. And in all ages the same explanation of it has been given, viz. that the present life is not the whole of man's existence, and that BEYOND THE GRAVE exact retribution awaits every one. This explanation is the only one which the felt majesty of the moral law permits us to entertain. It forbids us to believe that any one can, in the long run, be a loser by doing right. Consequently, since some men have, by losing life, lost all earthly good through uprightness, there must be a life beyond the grave in which they will receive due recompense. Otherwise, the moral law will be their debtor with a debt it can never pay; which is inconceivable. Thus, in all ages, the death of the righteous has revealed to men a hope beyond the grave. See further in ch. 54.

18. We now see that, just as the material universe cannot explain its own origin, or the origin of motion and of life, or the moral sense of man, and thus bears witness

to the existence of a Power other and higher than the forces observed in the visible world, so the present life by its incomplete retribution bears witness to an existence beyond the limits of man's observation. In other words, in the visible world and the moral sense of men we see footprints, and hear the voice, of an invisible and intelligent Creator and Ruler; and in the present life we find indications of a LIFE TO COME. These inferences, viz. (1) that the universe sprang from One Supreme Intelligence, whose (2) voice we hear in the moral sense of man; and (3) that retribution beyond death awaits all men for all actions done on earth, belong to the domain of NATURAL THEOLOGY.

These inferences, so vast in their influence on the higher life of man, must be attributed, not simply to man's intelligence, but to the Creator's deliberate purpose. In other words, we must believe that He created the universe and man such as they are or were in order through His works to make Himself known to his intelligent creatures. If so, we have in the material universe, in the moral sense of man, and in the social life of men, a direct *unveiling* or REVELATION of God, and by God, to men.

That this universal revelation in Nature has been in some measure apprehended in all ages and nations, we have abundant proof in the extant LITERATURE of the ANCIENT world, in which we find laid open to inspection the thoughts of men who lived long before the supreme historical revelation given to men in Christ and far from the preparatory historical revelations given to Israel: see §§ 8f, 14f, 477ff. This remarkable confirmation of our own inferences from matters which come under our own observation gives to this ancient literature immense value for the theologian.

19. These inferences, thus confirmed, are of highest IMPORTANCE. For we cannot doubt that, inasmuch as the

creation of matter and motion and life is a much greater work than their maintenance, so their Unseen Source is greater than the forces observed in the material world; and that the life beyond the grave, in which the retribution begun here will receive its consummation, is of vastly greater moment than the present life. Moreover, we are marching to the grave; and are reluctant to leave the brightness and the pleasures of the world around us. Our expectation of retribution beyond the grave evokes in us a consciousness of personal sin; and our deep sense of the inevitable and proportionate sequence of action and retribution awakens, as we approach the dark river of death, a fear that beyond it we shall meet the consequences of our past misdeeds. On the other hand, we are sure that beyond that silent shore blessing awaits the righteous. Thus the indications of existence after death create in us a felt need, viz. of deliverance from the future penalty of past sins. We soon become conscious of another need. Our fear of punishment prompts efforts to do right, that by future obedience we may atone for past neglect. Whether the future can thus atone for the past, is very doubtful; but it is all that remains under our control. Sad to say, these efforts do but reveal our moral powerlessness and bondage. Our past sins are a present power forcing us along our former evil path. This bondage, once felt, becomes an intolerable degradation; and strengthens our fear of further punishment. In other words, our preliminary studies have aroused in us a sense of DOUBLE NEED, viz. of pardon for past sin, and of liberation from present bondage.

20. The help we need, we CANNOT FIND in the material world, or from our fellows, or in the moral law. Nature tells of invariable sequences, but suggests nothing which will break the observed sequence of past sin, present bondage, and future punishment. The moral law marks out the right

path, but does little to help those who find themselves unable to go along it. If help is to be found it must come from sources other than these. But, inasmuch as whatever is true is in harmony with whatever else is true, the help we seek must be in HARMONY with the facts already noted. Consequently, the salvation we seek must pay homage to the supreme majesty of the moral law. Such salvation, is the practical aim of Theology. We seek to learn all we can about the Unseen Intelligence, whose power and skill we have traced in the material universe and whose voice we have heard in the moral sense of man; in order that in Him we may find the deliverance and blessing we have vainly sought in the things and men around.

21. The above SCANTY OUTLINES are sufficient to indicate the methods of NATURAL THEOLOGY, its place in the moral and spiritual life of men, and its relation to the historical revelations recorded in the Bible. The former is a broad foundation already laid in the material universe and in the hearts and experiences of men: the latter is a solid structure afterwards built upon it, in which we find salvation and all that we need for our spiritual development.

PART II

CHRISTIANITY AND CHRIST

CHAPTER IV

THE CONTRAST OF CHRISTIAN AND NON-CHRISTIAN NATIONS: ITS CAUSE

22. AMONG the various religions of the world, which all embody more or less clearly the three doctrines of Natural Theology noted in § 18, ONE RELIGION occupies the place of UNIQUE SUPERIORITY. Christian nations hold, and for a thousand years have held, with few exceptions, a practical monopoly of sustained progress and of all the higher forms of good. All non-Christian nations are, and for long ages have been, sinking helplessly into decay; except such as, *e.g.* India and Japan, are being raised by influences received in recent years from Christian nations. But these last, with scarcely an exception, bear marks of progress, material, intellectual, and moral.

23. The Christian nations form, in spite of their many wars, in a very real sense a POLITICAL BROTHERHOOD, in which the rights of the weakest are respected and the power of the strongest is limited. But no Christian nation treats or can treat with Turkey or Persia or China as on equal terms. No Christian nation would tolerate the interference with its internal administration to which again and again Turkey has submitted; nor would any Christian nation try to impose on another such interference. Even the vast population of China, equal probably to that of the six great powers of

Europe combined, and its immense material resources, do not make that empire equal in political influence to any one of these. In internal administration, we notice a similar inferiority. Outside the Christian nations and Christian influence, constitutional government, or even government for the good of the governed, is unknown. As compared with Christian nations, in spite of their many corruptions, the non-Christian nations stand on a definitely lower level.

The wonderful progress in NATURAL SCIENCE, so marked a feature of the last century, has been confined to the Christian nations. In this direction, the non-Christian nations, so far from marching in the front, can scarcely follow; as witness, the backwardness of surgery in China and Persia. Art bears the same evidence. Non-Christian nations add nothing now of equal merit to our galleries of sculpture and painting, or to the world's treasury of music. Nor do they contribute anything to the higher forms of literature. In every kind of culture, as of power, a practical monopoly is held by the Christian nations.

To this monopoly, the marvellous awakening and uprising of JAPAN are no exception. For they are due entirely to contact with Christian nations; and to the discovery, within the last fifty years, by influential Japanese, of the vast superiority of Christian civilisation as compared with that of Japan and China. They sent their sons to learn the wisdom of the West and to imitate its methods and manners. The lessons thus learnt prompted their government to seek admission to the brotherhood of the Christian nations; and enabled them to defeat on sea and land the least favoured and most backward of the nations of Europe. Their recent progress is not more wonderful than the stagnation which for so many centuries paralysed this clever people. It is to be hoped that Japan, so successful in learning from the West

in matters material, will not only maintain the advance made but contribute to the higher thought and the moral and spiritual life of our race.

24. This monopoly becomes the more remarkable when we remember that art, science, culture, and political and military power did not owe their origin to Christianity, but attained high development long BEFORE CHRIST was born and far from the nation which was waiting for His coming. The military skill of Alexander, of Hannibal, and of Cæsar is recognised by all modern soldiers. Roman Law is still studied with respect in our Universities. The artists of our day draw inspiration still from the art of ancient Greece. In the same gifted race, or in earlier races, science had its beginning: and in literature, the masterpieces of ancient Greece still hold their place of highest honour.

But, when Christ appeared, the culture of Greece had long passed its prime, and the power of Rome bore already seeds of decay. Within three centuries of His death, the greatest ruler in the world thought fit to acknowledge the supreme royalty of Christ. The barbarian invaders who threatened to destroy the civilisation of the ancient world accepted the religion, and with it the civilisation, of the empire they trampled under foot. Imperceptibly and silently Christ has laid His hand upon every form of material good, and has given it to the nations which acknowledge His sway.

The SUSTAINED PROGRESS of modern Christian nations presents a marked contrast to the history of the ancient world. The ancient empires, mighty as they were, had little permanence, or at least permanent progress. The splendid empire of Nebuchadnezzar rose, culminated, and fell, in much less than a century. The military prowess, and the art and literature, of Greece began to fade almost as soon as they had reached their bloom. The solid empire of Rome was erected

on the crushed liberties of the Roman people; and soon gave evidence of the corruption which eventually destroyed it. But for a thousand years the history of the Christian nations has been a history of progress. There have been times of apparent retrogression: but it has been only the momentary retreat of the incoming tide. Some nations have lagged behind: but even the most backward have recently made some advance.

25. Far more important than the material progress just mentioned is the growth, in the Christian nations, of the sense of RIGHT, of mutual KINDNESS, of COMPASSION for the helpless, of REGARD FOR human LIFE, and of all that makes up the higher life of man. When Christ was born, the world was sinking hopelessly, in spite of considerable culture, into deep and deeper moral corruption. And to-day, everywhere outside the Christian nations and Christian influences, there is still moral stagnation and decay. But in all Christian nations we see, in spite of many blemishes, real moral progress, apparent in the habits of society, in a purer and stronger public opinion, and in more earnest effort to help the weak and the unfortunate.

26. This MONOPOLY of sustained PROGRESS by the professedly Christian nations is the most conspicuous feature of human life and history. Before Christ came, there was general progress, scattered over many widely separated nations: but it was fitful; and its forms were transient. In His day, its force seemed to be spent; and apparently universal and hopeless decay had set in. But now a new element comes silently on the scene. Amid the ruins of the ancient civilisation, a new civilisation, a new morality, and a new hope begin to develop. A new progress, slow but sure, is soon detected. The progress is maintained; and extends to every department of human life. Out of the chaos of

the ancient world rises the solid structure of modern society: and, strangest of all, this wonderful progress in everything that pertains to human welfare is found only in those nations which recognise the supreme authority of an obscure and apparently untrained teacher who was laid in the grave before He had reached His prime. It is scarcely too much to say that to-day every Christian nation is rising in material and moral good: and certainly no non-Christian nation is rising mentally and morally except by contact with Christian nations. This remarkable phenomenon demands explanation.

27. It is right to admit that in all Christian countries thousands disobey the commands of Christ, that many NEGLECT UTTERLY all religious ordinances, and that some leaders of thought REJECT the distinctive teaching of the earliest Christian records. But this by no means proves that they are not benefited by the teaching they neglect or reject. For we are often greatly, though unconsciously, affected by influences we resolutely resist. In Christian countries, Christian influences are everywhere and always operating. The mass of the people recognise Jesus as incomparably the greatest Teacher the world has ever known. His words are more or less familiar to them: to Him they turn in their better moments: and by His teaching, directly or indirectly, their moral sense is raised and strengthened. Moreover, in all Christian countries the number of sincere servants of Christ is much larger than at first sight appears: and their influence for good permeates the entire community.

The unique position of Christianity among the nations is not made less remarkable, although its influence for good is lessened, by the many DIVISIONS of the followers of Christ. For these do but slightly veil a wonderful underlying unity. All Christians agree to assert that Jesus of Nazareth is

incomparably the greatest moral Teacher that ever lived. And, with exceptions too few to mention, they all agree in the remarkable belief that the Crucified One is the Eternal Son of God and the Creator of the universe; that in order to save men He became Himself Man; that in order to remove a barrier between God and man caused by man's sin He willingly submitted to die; that He rose from the dead; and that He will return in splendour to raise the dead, to judge all men, and to set up an Eternal Kingdom. That these remarkable doctrines are held firmly by almost all religious men in all the foremost nations, and that these nations hold the position already described, are facts urgently demanding explanation.

28. Of the remarkable pre-eminence of the Christian nations, NO EXPLANATION can be found except their Christianity: for this is the only element they have in common and in distinction from other nations. Their superiority cannot be attributed to race: for, as their languages prove, the Hindus and Persians are kinsmen of the Europeans, and the Hungarians and Finns are alien. Nor can it be attributed to climate or geographical position: for in these respects the progress of Russia, slow but real, in spite of terrible disadvantages, puts to shame the stagnation of China with every advantage.

29. In default of any other explanation, we turn now to HISTORY, in order to trace the steps by which the UNIQUE RELIGION mounted to its place of power.

Christianity arose suddenly out of an obscure nation and out of a national religion. In the ancient world, the JEWISH RACE stands alone. Its Sacred Books never stoop to tolerate idolatry. They speak ever of One intelligent and merciful Creator and Ruler of the world, and reveal a personal intercourse with Him unique in ancient literature. Equally

conspicuous is the joyful expectation, here and there expressed, of world-wide and glorious blessings to come. The same books contain an intelligible account of the beginning of the world; and a national history without parallel for its compass and completeness and for its spiritual significance. In its assured knowledge of God the Jewish nation stood, at the time of Christ, far above all others: and in our own day its ancient literature is of highest spiritual profit even to those who sit at the feet of One Greater than Moses.

Yet, in spite of this immense superiority, the religion of Israel made little mark on the religious thought and life of the nations around. Doubtless, in the minds of many Gentiles, the loftier conception of God embodied in the Jewish Scriptures and read in the synagogues of the Dispersion had prepared a way for the Gospel. But, on the nations around, the influence of the Jewish religion was not conspicuous. At the birth of Christ, the race itself, like many others, seemed to have passed its prime. National independence was irretrievably lost: the long line of prophets and teachers had ceased: in the sacred land disorder prevailed. Nothing remained to Israel in the widespread and deepening gloom except the hope of a coming Deliverer.

30. Suddenly, through the preaching of the followers of One whom the leaders of His race had murdered, the waters of Shiloah, which for many centuries had trickled unobserved among the nations, BURST THEIR BANKS and overspread the world, carrying everywhere moral and spiritual fertility, where before had been only barrenness and decay. To-day, wherever the name of Christ is honoured, the songs of Zion are sung: wherever they are not sung by Christian lips, barrenness and decay continue.

This marvellous outburst of the rill of Judaism into the river of Christianity must be attributed to Jesus of Nazareth.

For to Him points, as the source of all the blessings conferred in the Gospel, all Christian life and thought as embodied in literature and history. To all Christians, Christ is both the Source of all good and the unique Pattern of all excellence. In their view, loyalty to Him involves every virtue. Other religions have had personal founders: but none has been so completely dominated by one Personality. And, if Christianity be due to Christ, He has saved our race from the ruin into which in His day it was hopelessly sinking; and has turned back the course of human history into a new path of sustained progress: for, as we have seen, these are found only in the nations which bow to Him.

31. The rise and the effects of Christianity are the more wonderful because apparently until within some THREE YEARS of His death, which took place before He had reached His prime, its Founder was, according to the earliest Christian records, an unknown artisan in a country town of the outlying province of Galilee. During this short space of a young man's life was exerted an influence which has changed the entire current of human thought and the whole aspect of human life. We ask eagerly, Who and what was Jesus, and how came He to exert in so short a time so wonderful an influence on all succeeding ages? We cannot accept for a moment any theory of the universe which fails to explain His immense influence for good, as attested by the records of the past and by the present condition of the nations of the world. Our question is the more pressing because, as we shall see, He confirms our inferences in chs. 1–3 touching an Unseen Creator and Ruler and a life beyond the grave, and offers to supply a deep need which these inferences cannot satisfy.

PART III

THE SACRED RECORDS

CHAPTER V

THE NEW TESTAMENT: AUTHORSHIP AND DATE

32. SINCE Christ is separated from us by long centuries, our only sources of information about His life and teaching are WRITTEN DOCUMENTS. From His own pen, we have nothing. But from His immediate followers we have writings affording abundantly all the evidence we need.

We have in the N.T. four short accounts of the life and teaching of Christ. Then follows a narrative of the preaching and work of the apostles after the death of Christ, and of the founding of Christian Churches among Jews and Gentiles. In the former part of the book, the chief place is occupied by Peter; in the latter, by Paul. We have also thirteen letters, to Churches or to individuals, bearing the name of Paul, and professing to have been written, some while he was engaged in active apostolic work, others while in prison; a most interesting but anonymous letter contrasting Christ with angels, with Moses, and with the high-priests of Israel, and the death of Christ on the cross with the Jewish sacrifices; another letter to the scattered tribes of Israel by a writer who calls himself James; two letters bearing the name of the apostle Peter; an anonymous letter closely related, in thought and phrase, to the Fourth Gospel; two others, to a woman and a man, from a writer calling himself "the elder;" and one from Jude or Judah, a "brother of

James." Lastly we have a remarkable and beautiful prophetic and symbolic work from one who four times calls himself John, containing seven letters to Churches in the Roman province of Asia and many visions seen by the writer in the Ægean isle of Patmos.

33. This collection of books contains ALL THE CHRISTIAN LITERATURE which can be securely traced to the FIRST CENTURY of our era. Moreover, all subsequent Christian literature for two centuries, in worth and even in style, falls far below these earlier works. Below most of them, all other Christian literature falls immeasurably.

Although apparently a casual collection of independent documents, the N.T. bears marks of completeness and of organic UNITY. It gives a fourfold picture of a Man, and an account of the origin of a movement. The Man thus portrayed bears a Name infinitely the Greatest known among men: and the movement thus described has turned the whole course of human thought and life from hopeless ruin into the sustained progress of the Christian nations of our day. This supreme Man and this all-transforming movement could not have been better described than as we find them depicted, in wonderfully small space, in the N.T. To describe the Man, and the movement to which He gave birth, are the aim which dominates the whole collection: so Jno. 20^{31}, Lk. 1^{1-4}.

34. AUTHORSHIP AND DATE. The thirteen letters which claim to have been written by PAUL were accepted as his without a shadow of doubt by all Christian writers and by not a few opponents of Christianity, from *Irenæus*, who became bishop of Lyons in A.D. 180, and his later contemporaries *Clement* of *Alexandria* and *Tertullian* of Carthage onwards, and in a still earlier document giving a list of the books of the N.T., and commonly called the *Fragment of Muratori*.

The 1*st Ep. to the Corinthians* is mentioned, as written by Paul, in a letter from the Church at Rome to that at Corinth, known as the *Ep. of Clement*, written apparently at the beginning of the 2nd century. Moreover, the severe condemnation of the readers is decisive proof of its genuineness. For, had this last been open to doubt, the epistle would certainly have been repudiated by those so severely condemned. Closely connected with 1 Corinthians in thought and style, and by the references in 1 Cor. 16^{1-4}, 2 Cor. 8, 9, Rom. 15^{25-28} to the collection for the Christians at Jerusalem, and by other internal marks, are 2 *Corinthians* and *Romans*. With this last, the *Ep. to the Galatians* is so closely related in teaching and phraseology as to banish all doubt that both are from the same pen. These four epistles have been accepted as genuine by nearly all scholars, even by not a few who repudiate the teaching of Paul but cannot deny that he wrote these four letters.

These letters are of infinite importance to our present inquiry. For they take us at once by sure steps into the presence of the greatest of the apostles of Christ, and enable us to hear the Gospel from his lips and to look at Christ as He was seen by Paul.

The external evidence for the Ep. to the Romans is valid also for those to *Philippi*, *Colossæ*, *Ephesus*, and to *Philemon*. Written as they were after the close of the narrative in the Bk. of Acts, we have not for them the confirmatory evidence derived from it. But their deep underlying harmony with the earlier group in thought and phrase, along with a very valuable development in these later epistles, is in my view decisive evidence of their genuineness. Similar evidence attests the genuineness of 1 and 2 *Thessalonians*; and, with reasonable probability, that of 1 and 2 *Timothy* and *Titus*.

35. In the Bk. of Acts, no reference is made to the epistles of Paul. But various indications, *e.g.* ch. 24^{17} (cp. 1 Cor. 16^{1}, 2 Cor. 8, 9, Rom. 15^{26}), suggest or prove that these four epistles were written on Paul's THIRD MISSIONARY JOURNEY; 1 *Corinthians* probably from Ephesus shortly before the tumult, 2 *Corinthians* from Macedonia, and *Romans* from Greece during the three months' sojourn mentioned in Acts 20^{3}. This fixes with reasonable certainty the time and place of the letters to Corinth and Rome. That to the *Galatians* is open to more doubt. The letters to *Thessalonica* were written apparently on Paul's second missionary journey; one very soon after he left that city as narrated in Acts 17^{10}, and the other probably during his eighteen months' stay at Corinth mentioned in ch. 18^{11}.

The *Epp. to the Ephesians*, *Philippians*, *Colossians*, and to *Philemon* profess to have been written in PRISON. This places them after Paul's arrest at Jerusalem. And the serene calm which dominates them, in marked contrast to the eager activity which agitates the epistles mentioned above, suggests irresistibly that they come from a later period of his life, probably during his imprisonment at Rome.

The letters to *Timothy* and *Titus* are closely related. And, inasmuch as two of them were, if genuine, evidently written when Paul was free, and we find in the Bk. of Acts no account of a visit (cp. Tit. 1^{5}) of Paul to Crete, it seems probable that he was liberated from the imprisonment at Rome mentioned in Acts 28^{30}, that he then went (1 Tim. 1^{3}) to Ephesus, Macedonia, and Crete, and there wrote these three letters, the last of them in a second imprisonment.

Thus the letters of Paul fall into FOUR GROUPS, written respectively during the spring, summer, autumn, and winter of his eventful life. The genuineness and time and place of writing of the second and third groups, which contain

his most important writings, are discussed fully in my *Commentaries*. These may, as I have there proved, be accepted with confidence as written by Paul; as may the first group, and, with reasonable confidence, the fourth group.

36. The FOUR GOSPELS were accepted by Irenæus (*e.g.* bk. iii. 1[1]) as written by Matthew and John, the latter being "the disciple who lay on the bosom of the Lord," by "Mark the disciple and interpreter of Peter," and by "Luke the follower of Paul." At the torn-off beginning of the Fragment of Muratori, we read of the "third book of the Gospel, according to Luke," who is called a physician and a companion of Paul; and of the "fourth of the Gospels, by John one of the disciples." This tradition was accepted with complete confidence by all later writers: and no other author's names were ever suggested. Either therefore the Gospels are in some real sense from these four men, or the actual authors have been utterly forgotten and others have throughout the entire Church in many lands been put in their place. In any case, this unanimous tradition is decisive proof that the Gospels are not later than the beginning of the 2nd century: and their dissimilarity in thought and phrase proves that they are independent of the letters of Paul.

On the other hand, the close relation between the three SYNOPTIC GOSPELS reveals a common source. Probably the traditional narratives and teaching of Christ crystallized early into definite form; and from this common stock the writers or editors of the three Gospels drew their materials. Indeed Justin, who died as a martyr about A.D. 166, although he never mentions the Evangelists by name, quotes from "the memoirs of the Apostles" the words of Christ as contained in the Synoptic Gospels. The above traditional evidence is not appreciably confirmed in the case of *Matthew* and

Mark, as was the external evidence for the letters of Paul, by internal evidence. For we have nothing else from their pens, and we know little about them. In the case of *Luke*, it is confirmed by the Bk. of Acts: see below.

The FOURTH GOSPEL contains abundant and decisive internal evidence of its historic truth and extreme accuracy; *e.g.* the exact specifications of time in chs. $1^{29, 35, 40, 44}$, $2^{1, 13}$, 6^{4}; the vivid pictures of men who in the Synoptic Gospels are only empty names, *e.g.* Andrew, Philip, and Nathanael, in ch. $1^{40, 44, 46\text{-}51}$; and details unknown apparently to the other Evangelists, *e.g.* ch. $18^{13, 15f, 24}$. It has also indications that it comes from the apostle *John*; *e.g.* the absence of any mention of John the son of Zebedee, and the mention of an unnamed one called "the disciple whom Jesus loved." For it is impossible otherwise to account for this remarkable omission and circumlocution. That the Fourth Gospel gives a correct account of the teaching of Christ, is confirmed by the profound harmony, which in our further research we shall find underlying wide diversity of form, between this teaching as there recorded and that of Paul: *e.g.* Jno. $3^{14\text{-}18}$, compared with Rom. $1^{16, 17}$, $3^{22\text{-}26}$.

Closely related to the Fourth Gospel in phraseology, thought, and tone, and indisputably from the same pen, is the FIRST EP. OF JOHN.

37. A reference in Acts 1^{1}, supported by a unanimous tradition and by much internal evidence, attributes the BK. OF ACTS to the author of the Third Gospel. The first person plural in Acts $16^{10, 15, 16, 17}$, $20^{5, 6, 13, 14, 15}$, $21^{1\text{-}18}$, $27^{1, 2}$, $28^{2, 10\text{-}16}$ implies that the writer was a companion of Paul. And a multitude of coincidences with the letters of Paul attest the historic truth and minute accuracy of this most valuable narrative.

38. All the above books were accepted without a trace

of contradiction or doubt by all early Christian writers, from Irenæus and the Fragment of Muratori onwards, as written by the men whose names they now bear. So was also 1 PETER; but we have no other evidence with which to test this tradition. Even Peter's speeches in the Bk. of Acts do not help us. All the above documents were called by Eusebius (*Church History* bk. iii. 25) and by later writers the ACKNOWLEDGED books of the New Testament. They comprise more than six-sevenths of the whole. The other books were more or less DISPUTED, as of doubtful authorship.

39. The writer of the Epistle to the HEBREWS claims in ch. 2^{3} to belong to the second generation of the followers of Christ. And this early date is confirmed by the reference to Timothy in ch. 13^{23}. The later tradition which attributes it to Paul is of no value; and the distinguishing characteristics of the letters of Paul, *e.g.* the term *adoption*, and the phrases *justified by faith*, *in Christ*, and *dead with Christ*, are absent. But its intrinsic worth, so much above the literature of the 2nd century, justifies abundantly its place in the sacred volume. Its author is unknown.

The Ep. of JAMES gradually obtained recognition as written by "James, the Lord's brother" (Gal. 1^{19}), who occupied, as we infer from ch. 2^{9}, Acts 12^{17}, 15^{13}, 21^{18}, a position of unique influence in the Church at Jerusalem. The same man, evidently well known, is mentioned by Josephus, *Antiq.* XX. 9^{1}.

Internal indications, and especially a type of teaching differing most widely from that of Paul and in some respects approaching that of the First Gospel, strongly confirm this traditional authorship.

Of 2 PETER, we have no quotations or indisputable traces till the 3rd century, and these are doubtful. It is placed by Eusebius (*Ch. Hist.* bk. iii. 25) among the disputed

books. Moreover, this absence of external witnesses is not counterbalanced by internal evidence. For, both in thought and style, it differs greatly from 1 Peter. We cannot therefore accept it with confidence as a genuine work of the apostle: nor can we determine its date. But we notice a close similarity, in matter, order, and words, of 2 Peter 2 to the rather better attested Ep. of JUDE. This last writer is called a "brother of James." And in Mt. 13^{55}, Mk. 6^{3}, Christ is said to have brothers James and Jude. Possibly he may be the apostle called in Lk. 6^{16} "James' Jude." The SECOND and THIRD Epp. of JOHN were counted among the "disputed" books. But internal evidence somewhat confirms the tradition that they were written by the apostle John.

40. The BK. OF REVELATION is quoted by Justin (*Dialogue with Trypho* ch. 81) in the middle of the second century, and apparently by Irenæus and other early writers, as written by the apostle John. But the strange grammatical forms in chs. 1^{5}, $2^{13, 20}$, $3^{9, 12}$, 4^{8}, 5^{6}, 9^{14}, $14^{7, 14}$, 19^{20}, 20^{2}, the prominence of the writer's name in chs. $1^{1, 4, 9}$, 22^{8}, in contrast to the conspicuous absence of all mention of John the son of Zebedee in the Fourth Gospel, *e.g.* chs. 13^{23}, 19^{26}, $21^{20\text{-}24}$, and other differences of phraseology make it difficult to believe that both documents are from the same pen. This difficulty is greatly increased by a totally different cast of theological thought. The Fourth Gospel and First Ep. are dominated by the thought of "eternal life" for "every one that believes" in Christ: so chs. $3^{14\text{-}18, 36}$, 5^{24}, 11^{25f}, 20^{31}, 1 Jno. 5^{13}. It is inconceivable that an apostle who had learnt so thoroughly from the lips of Christ this great dominating truth of eternal life through faith in Him would omit all trace of it, and indeed all mention of *faith*, in a book so long as that of Revelation, and especially in the seven

letters to the Churches: contrast 1 Jno. 5 [1, 4, 5, 10, 13]. To harmonize this conflicting internal evidence with the early and weighty external evidence, is the most difficult problem in N.T. Introduction. But this difficulty does nothing to weaken the abundant evidence that the Fourth Gospel is a correct account of the life and teaching of Christ; or to disprove the tradition which asserts that we owe it to the apostle John. Moreover, whatever doubts gather round its authorship, the Bk. of Revelation unquestionably comes down to us from the Apostolic Age; and is, as we shall see throughout this volume, a most valuable element in the Christian Records.

41. With the N.T., NO OTHER Christian WRITINGS can be compared in early date and in value. This is at once apparent by comparison with the Ep. of Clement of Rome, the earliest other Christian document.

The DATES of the letters of Paul are determined, within narrow limits, by decisive internal evidence: see § 35. But the dates and circumstances of the other N.T. books are altogether UNKNOWN. All of them, except perhaps the Ep. of James, are apparently later, probably much later, than the arrest of Paul at Jerusalem: Acts 22^{24}. Consequently, the first two groups of Paul's letters, and perhaps the third group, are the earliest extant Christian documents. And their genuineness is certain. Moreover, whatever doubt gathers round 2 Peter, we may accept the rest of the N.T. with reasonable confidence, most of it with complete certainty, as a product of the Christian thought of the first century. And most of it is manifestly independent of the Epp. of Paul. In other words, we have in the N.T. a chorus of witnesses, in large measure independent, touching Christ and the Gospel, speaking to us from the inmost circle of His immediate followers.

Note carefully, in the N.T., INDICATIONS of authorship, and of time and place of writing. For example, Acts 13^{39} is a close coincidence (see § 170) with the letters of Paul: and Mt. 16^{28} suggests that when the First Gospel was written some of the actual disciples of Christ still survived. These various indications will greatly strengthen our conviction that we have in the N.T. a correct picture of actual life.

42. That our GREEK TEXT reproduces, within narrow limits, the books of the N.T. as originally written, is proved by the close agreement of many hundreds of Greek MSS. of all ages, some of them written in the 4th century; of ancient versions of the N.T. in various languages; and of numerous quotations in early Christian writers. All these give practically the same text of the New Testament. They reveal, however, innumerable verbal differences; most of them so trifling as not perceptibly to affect the sense, and others at once discredited by an overwhelming mass of contrary evidence. The close agreement of the best MSS. is proved by the close agreement of all recent Critical Editions, each giving a revised text and more or less of the evidence on which it rests. Of these I may mention those of Lachmann in A.D. 1842–50, Tischendorf, 8th ed. 1869–72, Tregelles, 1857–70, and of Westcott and Hort in 1881. In this last, vol. i. p. 561, we read: "If comparative trivialities, such as changes of order, the insertion or omission of the article with proper names, and the like, are set aside, the words in our opinion still open to doubt can hardly amount to more than a 1,000th part of the whole."

The various readings of these Critical Editions may be conveniently found in many popular editions of the Greek Testament. Some such edition should be used by every theological student so that he may see at once all passages open to doubt. For the variations, few comparatively as

they are, sometimes affect doctrine: and doctrines are reliable only so far as they rest on an undisputed text. This department of sacred scholarship is called the TEXTUAL CRITICISM of the New Testament.

43. Fortunately this CRITICAL TEXT, as we may call it, is to be found, with all important variations noted in the margin, in our English *Revised Version*; in contrast to the *Received Text*, which underlies the *Authorised Version* and is much less correct. Sometimes we read in the margin that *many ancient authorities* add to, or omit, or alter, something in the Revisers' text. This formula implies serious doubt. A still stronger form is used in Jno. 1^{18}, *many very ancient authorities read.* Here the margin contains probably the correct reading. In Jno. 7^{53} we read, "*most of the ancient authorities omit John* vii. 53—vii. 11." This expresses the Revisers' judgment that these words are not genuine: but the interest attaching to this incident seemed to claim for it a place in the text. See also note on Mk. 16^{9}.

The form *some ancient authorities read* implies doubt, but with a good preponderance of probability in favour of the text. A still milder form is found in Rom. 5^{1}: *some authorities read.* Here all the best MSS. give "let us have peace:" but, so great has the difficulty of understanding this reading seemed, that many able expositors have rejected it as a very early, and for a time almost universal, error.

Where no marginal note is given, the Greek text underlying the R.V. may be accepted as for all practical purposes identical with the words actually written by the evangelists and apostles. Consequently, the marginal notes give, within narrow limits, the whole area of the N.T. text open to serious doubt. The student will do well, before beginning to study any part of it, to mark off carefully these doubtful passages. He will thus see how

few they are, and may accept the rest with reasonable confidence.

44. As a reproduction of the sense intended by the sacred writers, our REVISED VERSION is much superior to the *Authorised Version*. Even the uncouthness which has done much to bring it into disfavour is in no small part due to an effort to reproduce, even at a cost of elegance or grammar, the precise meaning of the original. In many places, the gain is very great. As examples, I may mention Lk. 22^{20}, where *the new covenant* (instead of *testament*) recalls the same phrase in Jer. 31^{31}, and thus sheds a world of meaning on our Lord's words: also 1 Cor. 9^{25}, where *striveth for the mastery* is nonsense, but the R.V. *striveth in the games* recalls the Greek athletic contests, to which Paul here refers: and the words *unveiled* in 2 Cor. 3^{18} and *veiled* in ch. 4^{3}, which keep before us the *veil* over Moses' face in ch. $3^{13, 14, 15}$, an important reference which the A.V. conceals. The new version is a help to a better understanding of the Bible which no one who uses chiefly an English version can afford to neglect.

The R.V. has, however, many BLEMISHES. Such is its frequent use of *unto* to denote aim or purpose, where *for* would have reproduced accurately and beautifully the Greek sense. Of this, a very bad example is found in 2 Cor. $5^{13, 15}$: "whether we are beside ourselves, it is *unto* God; or whether we are of sober mind, it is *unto* you . . . . no longer live *unto* themselves, but *unto* Him who for their sakes died and rose again." This is not intelligible English. What Paul meant was "*for* God . . . *for* you . . . *for* themselves." With strange inconsistency, this last rendering is used by the Revisers four times in 1 Cor. 6^{13}, for the same Greek construction: but the other clumsy rendering is much more frequent. Another similar blemish is the use

of the word *of*, not only to reproduce the Greek genitive, its proper use, but to represent two Greek prepositions signifying respectively *by* and *from*. So Mt. 2^{16}, "mocked *of* the wise men:" in contrast to *v.*^{15}, where the same preposition is accurately rendered "*by* the Lord." In 1 Cor. 8^{6}, 2 Cor. 5^{18}, the R.V. reads "*of* whom are all things," and "all things are *of* God;" where the Greek sense is "*from* whom" and "*from* God." The Revisers thus confound under one English rendering three Greek forms of altogether different meaning.

Fortunately, these blemishes, irritating as they are, do not, like some errors in the A.V., lead us actually astray. They conceal the meaning of the original; but they do not put a wrong meaning in its place. A careful use of the R.V. will reveal the meaning of the English fôrms used, and thus guide us to the sense intended by the sacred writers.

45. From the facts noted above, we learn that we have in the N.T. abundant and valuable EVIDENCE touching the life and teaching of CHRIST. These facts and others which the student will gather for himself by study of the N.T. will be found to be an essential link of the argument of this volume.

CHAPTER VI

THE NEW TESTAMENT: ITS TRUTH AND WORTH

46. WE shall now consider the evidence afforded by the books of the N.T. about the life and teaching of the Founder of Christianity.

In ch. v. we found, or pointed to, decisive proof that certain

letters preserved for us in the N.T. were written, in a form practically the same as that which we now possess, by the apostle Paul. Therefore, apart from the correctness or error of the rest of the Bible, these letters throw open to our inspection the MIND and THOUGHT of the most conspicuous of the early Christian teachers. In this volume we shall find that they give a consistent and complete account of the teaching of Christ as Paul understood it, and prove beyond possibility of doubt that he believed Christ to be in a unique sense the own Son of God and believed that the body of Christ laid dead in the grave returned to life.

We also found proof that nearly all the other books of the N.T. come down to us from the first or second generation of the followers of Christ. In their unanimous AGREEMENT, underlying marked differences, we shall find complete proof that Paul's belief touching the Gospel and Christ was shared by the early followers of Christ. And this UNANIMOUS BELIEF, viewed in the light of its circumstances and of its effect upon the world, will leave no room for doubt that Christ actually rose from the dead, that He actually and justly claimed this august relation to God, and actually proclaimed salvation from sin and eternal life for all who put faith in Him : see ch. 27.

Owing to the number and variety of the witnesses I shall bring, this argument would remain unshaken even if it were proved that some statements in the Bible CONTRADICT each other or contradict reliable contemporary history or the assured results of modern science. For, whereas error is always easily accounted for by human fallibility, the unanimity of our witnesses can be accounted for only by the truth of that in which they agree. In other words, we shall find in the N.T. all the documentary evidence needed for intelligent and saving faith in Christ.

47. In this evidence, the books of the N.T. are an ESSENTIAL

LINK. Had they not been written, we should not have a reliable account of the salvation announced by Christ or of the superhuman dignity claimed by Him; nor should we have decisive proof that He was raised from the dead. For, the main force of the proof I shall adduce is in contemporary documents which reveal the faith of the immediate followers of Christ. If the Epp. of Paul, the Gospels, and the Bk. of Acts or similar works had not been written, we should have no certain knowledge about Christ and no firm and intelligent faith in Him. Moreover, amid the vagaries of early Christian opinion, there would have been no standard of appeal. The historic faith would probably have been lost in the chaos of discordant beliefs prevalent in the second century. In other words, to the books of the N.T. we owe the survival and the controlling influence of Christianity.

Now, in the eternal past, in full view of all the future necessities of the case, God formed His PURPOSE to save fallen man. The earnestness of this purpose is revealed in the costliness of the means by which it was attained. A purpose so earnest must have included everything needful for its accomplishment. It must therefore have included the documentary evidence without which, as we have just seen, Christ would not have become the Light and the Life of the world.

The only satisfactory explanation of ALL THE FACTS of the case, especially of the completeness and proved trustworthiness of the records, is that God, who sent His Son into the world to proclaim a Gospel designed for all men in all ages, secured for future ages a record and exposition of this Gospel sufficiently accurate and extensive for the great purpose which God had in view. In this important sense and measure, the record, sufficient yet containing nothing superfluous, is a GIFT of Him who gave His Son to die for man.

48. The above account of the relation of the Christian Records to God's purpose of salvation is but a re-echo of Jno. 20^{31}: "Many other signs also did Jesus before the disciples, which are not written in this book. But these are written in order that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing ye may have life in His Name." In the argument of this work, this purpose is fulfilled before our eyes and in our hearts. As we read the ancient documents, we find in them complete proof that Christ is the eternal Son of God, and in Him we find and now enjoy a life which death cannot destroy.

It is needless to inquire whether the purpose asserted in this quotation is that of the HUMAN WRITER or of One greater than man. For we have already found proof that the human record was a fulfilment of a divine purpose. The words "these things were written," instead of "these things I have written," suggest that the author was conscious that in writing he was rather passive than active, *i.e.* that he had superhuman guidance.

Since the record was written by human hands, we are not surprised to find that the writers were prompted by the ORDINARY MOTIVES of good men. So, in Lk. 1^{1-4}, we find a man prompted to write by the attempts of others and by his own more accurate information. Possibly he was unconscious of superhuman guidance. But they who derive rich spiritual nourishment from the many incidents which he alone narrates see plainly in his writing a hand divine.

Manifestly the above passages are true of at least the greater part of the NEW TESTAMENT. For the evidence afforded by the letters of Paul is even more valuable than that of the Gospels. And it is strongly confirmed by the various yet unanimous testimony of the rest of the New Testament. Each book must be accepted, in proportion to

the evidence it affords about the teaching and the dignity of Christ, as embraced in God's purpose of salvation. Most of Paul's letters were written to meet special and passing emergencies. But their infinite value to us to-day reveals the hand of God providing in them for the abiding instruction and defence of His servants in all ages.

49. We saw in ch. 5 that the books of the N.T., though handed down by the ordinary means of human transmission, have come to us in a form practically the same as that in which they left the writers' hands. Without this uncorrupted PRESERVATION, and without full proof of it, the foundation of the Christian faith would have been seriously defective. We are therefore compelled to attribute not only the writing, but the preservation, of these title deeds of our inheritance to the kind care of the Head of the Church.

The purpose asserted in Jno. 20^{31} implies not only an accurate reproduction of the teaching of Christ, but a truthful narrative of FACTS. For our faith in the promises of Christ rests on our belief of certain historical events. Consequently, for assured faith, we need truthful historical records.

50. The general historical truthfulness of the N.T. must be tested by the methods of HISTORICAL RESEARCH used to sift the truth of other ancient documents. In chs. 26-28, we shall prove, by strictly historical methods, the most important matter of fact stated in the Bible, viz. that the body of Jesus laid dead in the grave came forth living and strong. This proof forbids us to set aside other statements simply because they involve an unusual exercise of supernatural power. Each statement must be examined on its own merits. Naturally, for the minor miracles of Christ, and for many details in His life and in the story of the founding of the Church, we have not the abundant evidence which

compels us to believe that He rose from the grave. But this supreme proof removes all antecedent improbability from such narratives as that of the raising of Lazarus. Moreover the analogy of nature suggests very strongly that the greater manifestation of the supernatural power of God was probably preceded by minor manifestations of the same. In each case, according to our need God has given to us. Upon the resurrection of Christ rests the historical proof of our hope of eternal life: and, of this great event, we have decisive evidence. The resurrection of Lazarus is full of instruction, but is not of equal importance; and is supported by evidence proportionately strong and clear.

Many casual references to matters of fact in the Epp. of Paul, I have carefully examined in my *Commentaries*. The examination has left on my own mind a deep conviction of the extreme accuracy of these references, and of the historical truthfulness of the Bk. of Acts. In the same volumes, I have also endeavoured to show the complete and profound harmony underlying the theological teaching of the entire New Testament. This harmony removes all doubt that in it we have an accurate record of the actual teaching of Christ. But this proof can be appreciated only by careful consecutive study of the sacred records.

51. It is right to say that here and there we find statements which have the appearance of INACCURACY. As examples, I may quote Mt. 9^{18}, where Jairus speaks of his daughter as already dead, whereas in Mk. $5^{23, 35}$, Lk. $8^{42, 49}$ he speaks of her as dying and afterwards hears that she is dead. In any other narratives, we should accept the two latter accounts as correct, and the first as slightly inaccurate. Similarly, the statement in Mk. 14^{12} touching the evening on which our Lord held the Last Supper, seems inconsistent with Jno. 18^{28}, 19^{31}. Still more difficult are Christ's words as

recorded in Mt. 16^{28} and the casual reference in ch. 10^{23}, also ch. 24^{34}, touching the nearness of His return.

The proved general accuracy of the N.T. forbids us to assume in it hastily ERRORS even in detail. And we notice that these discrepancies have no bearing on the spiritual and practical life of men. Consequently, they do not lessen, for the divine purpose for which it was given, the value of the N.T. as a record of the words and works of Christ. The great facts on which rest our trust in Christ and our hope of heaven are open to no doubt whatever.

All discrepancies must be treated as we should treat any other document of proved trustworthiness.

52. TO SUM UP. In the N.T. we find a statement and exposition of the teaching and personal claims of Jesus of Nazareth which we are compelled by historical evidence to accept as correct, and which are sufficient for all the spiritual needs of man. We have also documentary evidence which, taken in connection with other indisputable matters of fact and of immediate experience, affords complete proof that Christ actually rose from the dead. This evidence is an immovable foundation on which rests securely the faith which, in the Gospel, God requires as a condition of the salvation announced by Christ.

Had not these contemporary records been written, or had they not survived, we should have been in not a little doubt about the actual teaching of Christ; nor should we have had the indisputable historical proof which now assures us that He rose from the dead. If so, faith would lack a rational foundation: and the blessings to be attained by faith would be beyond reach of those who justly ask a reason for the Christian hope. In other words, an essential link in the chain of salvation would be wanting, Christ would not have become the Saviour of the World, and the purposes of mercy

for which God gave up His Son to die would not be attained.

We are therefore compelled to believe that the Christian records and their preservation were a part of God's purpose of salvation; that He, who in the eternal past resolved to send His Son into the world to proclaim good news of life to men condemned to die and Himself to die for man's sin and to rise from the dead in order thus to attest His divine mission, resolved also to secure for men a CORRECT and sufficient RECORD of the life and words and death and resurrection of Christ. Therefore, as a divinely-chosen means to accomplish a divine purpose, the N.T. is a gift of God to man.

53. God thought fit that the records should be written by human hands in ordinary human words and on ordinary materials, and be transmitted from generation to generation in the ordinary way. Now, as we shall see in ch. 14, the SPIRIT of God is the divine Agent of whatever God does in and through man. He is specially active in prompting the words of the servants of Christ: so Mt. 10^{20}, 1 Cor. 2^{13}. We therefore infer with confidence that we owe the various books of the N.T. to a special influence of the Holy Spirit on the minds and hearts of the writers of the N.T., giving them a clear comprehension of the matters about which they wrote, prompting them to write, suggesting suitable words, and guarding them from such error as would hinder the purpose for which the record was given to men.

To what extent this special INSPIRATION guarded the sacred writers from errors in detail, must be learnt by careful study of their writings. Consequently, our theory of inspiration must be framed, not by *a priori* reasoning at the beginning of our theological studies, but step by step as they make progress. For such theory, we can wait. For, as we shall see,

it is not needful for full confidence touching the facts of the life of Christ and the truth of His teaching. Such confidence, as we proceed, the facts adduced will evoke.

CHAPTER VII

THE OLD TESTAMENT: ITS CONTENTS, TRUTH, AND WORTH

54. ABUNDANT quotations and references throughout the N.T. leave no room for doubt that all the immediate followers of Christ and the race to which they belonged looked upon certain EARLIER BOOKS with special reverence, as in some sense divine; and that the books thus recognised were practically identical with the O.T. as we now have it. This gives to the O.T. special value as a permanent embodiment of the religious life of Israel before the appearance of Christ, a life unique among the religions of the ancient world; and as a record of words, phrases, and modes of thought in which that inner life took literary and logical form. These last are of great value as the RUDIMENTARY FORMS, modified so as to convey new ideas, in which the Gospel of Christ found its earliest verbal expression.

55. The O.T. differs from the N.T. in that, whereas the latter was written almost or altogether within less than a century and narrates only the events of a still shorter period, the former narrates events of MANY CENTURIES and was written evidently by men living centuries apart. The N.T. is a product of one age and of like conditions: the O.T. lays open to us the life, social, intellectual, and political, of

many ages under circumstances widely different. The one affords a picture of one supreme Person, and an account of the beginning of the greatest movement in the history of the world: the other traces the evolution of the Kingdom of God during long earlier ages, and preserves for us pictures of many men who, at various periods, guided the course of the nation which was more or less consciously preparing a way for the great Deliverer, and for the Eternal Kingdom He came to set up.

The O.T. differs also from the N.T. in that, while this latter takes little note of contemporary history, the O.T. opens to us a WIDE POLITICAL OUTLOOK and brings into view, not only the tribes immediately around Israel, otherwise little known, but also the great empires on the banks of the Nile and in Mesopotamia. From the rise and fall of these, and from their relation to Israel and to the Kingdom of God, we learn most valuable lessons political and religious.

Another contrast is that, whereas the O.T. was—except a few chapters in Ezra and Daniel in a cognate language—written in the LANGUAGE of Israel, known only to one small people and to surrounding tribes, the N.T. was written in Greek, a language spoken by a great part of the civilised world, and containing a literature of wide extent and of immense literary worth. The one was in harmony with the narrow national limits of the special revelation given to Israel; the other with the world-wide destiny of the Gospel of Christ.

56. The Jews divided the O.T. into four parts:—

1. THE LAW, *i.e.* the Pentateuch.

2. THE EARLIER PROPHETS, viz. Joshua to 2 Kings, excluding Ruth.

3. THE LATER PROPHETS, viz. Isaiah to Malachi, excluding Lamentations and Daniel.

4. THE WRITINGS, or Hagiographa: all other books, including Ruth, Lamentations, and Daniel.

A similar division is found in Lk. 24^{44}, where the chief part of the Hagiographa is put for the whole.

The first two divisions, taken together, form ONE CONTINUOUS HISTORY from the creation of the world to the destruction of Jerusalem. The regular sequence of books, each taking up the story of Israel where the preceding one lays it down, yet evidently written by different hands, reveals the unity of the whole. We have also, within the Hagiographa, another history extending, at first as a mere genealogy, but from the accession of David expanding into a full narrative, from Adam to the rebuilding and dedication of the wall of Jerusalem. This later work is contained in the Bks. of *Chronicles*, *Ezra*, and *Nehemiah*; the last two verses of 2 Chronicles being reproduced in Ezra 1^{1-3}, where a sentence broken off in 2 Chr. 36^{23} is completed.

Each of these histories is permeated and dominated by a distinctive tone and character of its own. The earlier work may be called PROPHETIC: for it expounds the spiritual significance of the history of the nation, after the manner of the prophets. The later one is PRIESTLY: for it pays special attention to all that concerns the outward forms of worship.

The BOOKS OF THE PROPHETS shed important light, from contemporary sources, on the history and condition of Israel and Judah; occupying, in relation to *Kings* and *Chronicles*, a position similar to that of the Epp. of Paul to the Bk. of Acts. They afford vivid pictures of national and religious life extending over three or four centuries before, during, and after the exile.

In the Bk. of PSALMS, the inner thought and life of Israel find permanent and varied expression; as does its pious shrewdness in the Bk. of PROVERBS, and its profounder

thought in that of JOB. Other interesting forms of literature are found in what are called THE FIVE ROLLS, comprising *The Song of Songs*, *Ruth*, *Lamentations*, *Ecclesiastes*, and *Esther*. The Bk. of DANIEL stands alone, widely separated in thought and mental outlook from the rest of the O.T. and presenting a type of religious literature prevalent among the Jews in the period between the completion of the O.T. and the appearance of Christ, and known as APOCALYPTIC.

57. The Bk. of GENESIS is anonymous. In the time of Christ, it was by the Jews (*e.g.* Philo, *Creation of the World* 1, 2, etc.) attributed to Moses. But this tradition was far removed from the time of writing, and might be accounted for by the greatness of Moses and the common desire to find an author for a well-known anonymous work. The book is never attributed to him in the many quotations found in the N.T. The absence in Gen. 49^{5-7} of any reference to the unique prerogatives of the tribe of Levi suggests an early date of the source from which this chapter was taken. But chs. 12^{6}, 14^{14} (cp. Jud. 18^{29}), 36^{31}, 40^{15} suggest a date later than Moses. Certain parts of EXODUS, *e.g.* chs. 17^{14}, 24^{4}, and DEUTERONOMY, *e.g.* ch. $31^{9,\ 30}$, are said to have been written by Moses. And frequently in the N.T., *e.g.* Jno. 1^{17}, the Law is attributed to him. Various indications, especially double narratives of the same events marked by different words and phrases, suggest strongly that the Pentateuch is from different sources; *e.g.* Gen. 2^{4b}–4 compared with chs. 1–2^{4a} and with ch. $5^{1\ 2}$.

The historical books, *Joshua*, *Judges*, *Samuel*, *Kings*, and *Chronicles* are anonymous.

The books of the *prophets* contain the writers' NAMES; and frequently the names of the kings under whom they prophesied, these last involving their dates. These dates are more or less confirmed by the contents. The Bk. of ISAIAH consists of

three clearly-divided parts, chs. 1–35, chs. 36–39, and chs. 40–66. Portions of part 1 are expressly attributed to Isaiah. Part 2 is historical; and in it Isaiah occupies the chief place. Part 3 is anonymous. Similarly Zech. 9–11 and 12–14 differ widely from chs. 1–8, which last is in chs. $1^{1, 7}$, 7^{1} attributed to *Zechariah*.

Many of the *Psalms* are attributed to David and some to other writers: but the titles are evidently from later hands; and we have few means of verifying them. The Bk. of *Proverbs* is attributed to Solomon and others. *Job* is anonymous, and contains no clear indication of authorship. Three of the five *rolls* are anonymous; the *Song* is said to be *Solomon's*; and his name is irresistibly suggested by Eccl. 1^{1}, and by much else in the book. But the contents of each book prove decisively that they were not written by him. Parts of the Bk. of *Daniel* are in the first person, as if by Daniel: but various indications suggest that it is much later than his day. Parts of the Bks. of *Ezra* and *Nehemiah* (Ezra 7^{27}, 10^{14}; Neh. 1–7, 12^{27-43}, 13^{4-31}) are in the first person, and may have been written by them. But in the Bk. of Nehemiah are notes of time, *e.g.* ch. $12^{10, 11, 22}$, which point to the century after his day.

58. For the CORRECTNESS of the TEXT of the O.T., we have not abundant evidence like that which leaves no room to doubt that we possess the N.T. in a form practically the same as that in which it was written. We have no copies of the original Hebrew text earlier than A.D. 700, and very few earlier than A.D. 1000. But the earliest copies of the N.T. contain also the *Septuagint* Greek version of the O.T. This translation was begun probably about B.C. 280. We have also *Targums*, or translations and paraphrases in *Aramaic*, the language spoken in Palestine in the time of Christ; and translations in *Syriac*, a cognate dialect spoken

by the early Syrian Church; and into *Latin*. To these must be added many *quotations* from the O.T. in the N.T. and in early Christian writings. The general agreement of these various sources of information assure us that, in the main, we have the Jewish Sacred Books in a form practically the same as that possessed by the Jews after the exile, and indeed as that in which they were written.

The O.T., as we now possess it, embraces all the extant earliest literature of Israel. The whole of it was accepted by both Jews and Christians without doubt as a true narrative of actual fact, and as in a unique sense the Book of God.

59. Along with the books mentioned above, all of which we now have in Hebrew or Aramaic, the oldest Greek copies of the O.T. contain, interspersed among them, other books now existing only in Greek, not recognised by the Jews as belonging to their Sacred Canon, and now called the APOCRYPHA. Some of these are of great value: *e.g.* the *First* Bk. of *Maccabees*, a reliable history of a most serious crisis in the history of the Jews; *Ecclesiasticus*, or the Wisdom of the Son of *Sirach*; and the so-called *Wisdom of Solomon*, a most valuable embodiment of the developing religious thought of Israel a century before the birth of Christ. These are worthy of careful study.

60. We come now to consider the estimate of the Old Testament held by the writers of the New.

Paul accepts the O.T. narratives as HISTORICAL FACT, and accepts as from God words therein attributed to Him: *e.g.* Rom. $4^{3\text{-}22}$, $5^{12\text{-}14}$, $9^{7\text{-}18}$, 1 Cor. $10^{1\text{-}11}$, Gal. 3^{17}, $4^{21\text{-}31}$; Rom. 7^{7}, 13^{9}, 14^{11}. In Gal. 4^{21}, Rom. 3^{19}, the ordinary words of the O.T., even a narrative in Genesis and quotations from the Psalms, are called "the Law." Purposes

far beyond the thought of its human writers are attributed to the O.T., *e.g.* Rom. 3^{19}, 4^{24}, Gal. $3^{8, 22}$. These remarkable passages prove that in Paul's thought a divine purpose underlay these ancient books. In Gal. 3^{16}, an argument is based on the absence of a single letter. But the word in which this letter is omitted occurs twelve times, *i.e.* in Gen. $13^{15, 16}$, $15^{5, 18}$, 17^{7-9}, $22^{17, 18}$. In Rom. 1^{2}, 2 Tim. 3^{15}, the O.T. books are called "Holy Scriptures" or "Writings;" and are thus separated from, and raised above, all others as standing in special relation to God, like the various *holy* objects of the Old Covenant. They are (2 Tim. 3^{16}) *God-breathed, i.e.* written under a special influence of the *Spirit* of God. All this proves that Paul confidently accepted the O.T. as a correct record of facts, and especially of supernatural communications from God to man, and as itself in a special sense the Law of God.

A similar use of the O.T. is found in Heb. 6^{14}, 7^{4}, 9^{20}; 2^{6}, 3^{5}; 8^{5}, 12^{21}. In chs. 3^{7}, 10^{15}, we find Ps. 95^{7-11} and Jer. 31^{33} quoted as the word and testimony of the Holy Spirit: so Acts 4^{25}. In Heb. 2^{7}, 10^{5}, incorrect renderings of the Lxx. are quoted and commented on. This warns us not to accept the N.T. as a decisive critical authority for the O.T. text. In ch. $11^{5, 6}$, an argument is based on an imperfect, though not incorrect, rendering of the Lxx.: but we notice that the imperfection of the rendering does not destroy the logical force of the argument.

The words of the prophets are in Mt. 1^{22}, 2^{15} attributed to God. Notice the constant phrase (διὰ τοῦ προφήτου) *through the prophet:* Mt. $2^{17, 23}$, 4^{14}, 8^{17}, etc. All this implies that the prophet was a mouthpiece of God. In the Gospels, Christ is frequently represented as assuming the historical truth of the O.T., and appealing to it as a decisive rule of conduct and of doctrine: *e.g.* Mt. 12^{3f}, 23^{35}, Jno. 3^{15}, 6^{31}, 7^{22}; Mt. 4^{4},

Jno. 10^{35}. In Mt. 8^{4}, He traces to Moses the O.T. ritual; yet in Mk. 7^{15} He sets aside Lev. 11^{43}, and in Mt. 5^{31}, 19^{7} He modifies the earlier Law.

61. All this implies, as does much else in the N.T., that the earliest followers of Christ accepted the O.T without doubt as a correct RECORD OF FACTS and of supernatural REVELATIONS from God to man; and as having been written, at least in parts, under a special influence of the Holy Spirit and as therefore itself in this sense a voice of God; and that they believed confidently that this was TAUGHT BY CHRIST. We notice however that the facts are given, not chiefly to teach history, but to confirm and illustrate the revelations; and that the quotations refer, not to solitary statements, but to broad principles underlying the entire O.T. This compels us to believe, either that the O.T. is substantially true, or that they to whom the Incarnate Son entrusted the Gospel of salvation were in serious error, touching the ancient records to which they constantly appealed. Such error is in the last degree unlikely.

But the use of the O.T. by writers of the N.T., *e.g.* 1 Cor. 10^{8}, Gal. 3^{17}, does not suggest that the writers of O.T. or N.T. were preserved from all inaccuracy, in details which have no bearing on the purposes for which the revelations were given. Compare also Ex. $21^{2\text{-}6}$, Deut. 15^{12}, Jer. 34^{14} with Lev. $25^{39\text{-}41}$; and 2 Sam. 24^{24} with 1 Chr. 21^{25}. All discrepancies must be judged, and the historic truth of the O.T. must be tested, as we should judge and test any other ancient documents.

62. In doing this, it is best to ASCEND THE STREAM of time, thus passing from the nearer to the farther off, from the better known to the less known.

In the books of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, with their plain statements of fact, and their specifications of time and place,

we find a solid historical foundation on which to build. We cannot doubt that their picture of the ruin of Israel reflects REALITY. Otherwise no Israelite would have painted it: and Jeremiah's sorrow is too deep to be feigned. Going further back, we have, for the reign of Hezekiah, and still earlier for that of Ahaz, statements of indisputable fact. Other contemporary pictures of national unworthiness, we find in Amos and Hosea, written evidently before the fall of Samaria.

The decadence of the nation, thus depicted, implies its earlier RISE: and of this the literature of Israel gives an intelligible and continuous narrative, bearing every mark of truth. No Jewish historian would invent the story of Israel's helpless bondage under the Philistines, in 1 Sam. $13^{19\text{-}22}$. We have a rational account of deliverance from foreign rule and of the founding of an independent commonwealth by Samuel, the strange story of Saul, the strong kingdom set up, with oriental rapidity, by David, culminating in the splendour of Solomon which however even before his death showed marks of decay, and its disruption under Rehoboam. Very true to life are the many revolutions, the general instability, and the earlier captivity, which followed the revolt of the ten tribes, in contrast to the kingdom of Judah where the dynasty of David held the throne till more than a century after the fall of the northern kingdom. With this living picture of a nation's rise, culmination, fall, and resurrection, and inner life, no other ancient history can for a moment be compared. The whole commends itself to us as substantially true.

The narrative is supported by an intelligible CHRONOLOGY without parallel in contemporary history.

63. Beyond the chaos which forms the background of its continuous history, Israel looked back to very definite events

and to a unique and commanding PERSONALITY. The deep impression made on the thought and religion of Israel by the story of the bondage in Egypt, the Exodus, the giving of the Law and the Ritual, the wandering in the wilderness, and the entrance into Canaan, is reflected on almost every page of its literature. So deep an impression, so fruitful in the religious life of the nation, can have been made only by reality. It is impossible to doubt that by the agency of MOSES, Israel was brought out from the land of bondage, and received a great religious impulse and forms of sacrificial and priestly worship which moulded its entire subsequent history.

Still earlier even than Moses, the nation looked back to an ancestor who at the bidding of God left his own country and lived as a stranger in the land which afterwards became the home of his descendants, and with whom God made a special covenant. The story of the patriarchs bears every mark of historic truth. And the immense influence of ABRAHAM on the spiritual life of Israel and the close parallel between his FAITH and experience and that of the servants of Christ, as expounded in Rom. 4, attest strongly the truth of the narrative. For it is far easier to believe that Abraham did thus put faith in God and was received by Him into an abiding covenant preparatory to the New Covenant in Christ than to believe that this wonderful anticipation of the Gospel was invented by a follower of Moses and the Law.

64. The substantial truth of the O.T. finds remarkable confirmation in the clear and unique knowledge of ONE PERSONAL GOD, the Creator of all things yet absolutely distinct from all that He has made, the righteous Ruler and Friend of men, a knowledge of God which illumines every part of the O.T. in marked contrast to all pre-Christian literature. For this wonderful ancient anticipation of the

religious faith of all modern civilised races can be accounted for only by a special and supernatural revelation not given to the rest of mankind, like that recorded in the Old Testament. Another indication of the same is found in Israel's unique expectation of marvellous BLESSINGS TO COME designed for all nations, *e.g.* Isa. 60, Dan. 2^{44}. The only conceivable explanation of this knowledge of God and hope of blessing to come is to be found in the historical revelations given to Abraham and through Moses to Israel as recorded in the Old Testament. Thus these remarkable phenomena, unique in literature, confirm the historic truth of the ancient record.

65. If the O.T. ritual was, in its main outlines and underlying principles, ordained by Moses, the Jewish records of it may have GRADUALLY reached their present FORM, probably in part after the exile. And, to some such origin points the literary structure of the Pentateuch. All details must be dealt with according to the principles of sound historical criticism.

The UNIQUE and harmonious ACCOUNT given in the O.T. of the history of the nation, an account explaining, and the only explanation of, its immense religious superiority to all other nations, at once claims our respect and acceptance. And the infinite spiritual value even to Christians of the history and literature of Israel reveal clearly in them the hand of God.

66. It is right to say that there are in the O.T. passages, *e.g.* Num. $31^{1\text{-}18}$, Jud. $5^{24\text{-}27}$, 1 Sam. $15^{1\text{-}3}$, Pss. $69^{22\text{-}28}$, 137^{9}, which do not commend themselves to us as MORALLY GOOD. But these were written under the preparatory covenant; and are a genuine expression and true record of real though immature spiritual life, and thus reveal the gradual development of the nation's moral sense. They are never appealed to in the O.T. as an abiding rule of conduct; and they prove that the O.T. is not throughout a moral standard for

Christians. The O.T. presents everywhere broad principles underlying all morality, and here and there, *e.g.* Lev. 19^{18}, Deut. 6^{5}, $10^{12, 13}$, 30^{6}, the highest application of them. In the N.T. we find, without admixture of imperfection, the loftiest morality we can conceive; and in the O.T. the same morality in the process of growth.

67. Nowhere in the Bible is the Hand of God more clearly seen than in its relation to NATURAL SCIENCE.

The Bk. of Genesis anticipated modern science by teaching that the world is earlier than the animal and vegetable life upon it; that the various forms of life arose successively, from lower to higher; and that man is one of the most recent forms of life. It goes beyond all natural science by asserting conspicuously that the universe and life arose at the bidding of one intelligent Creator, who afterwards entered into a definite covenant with Abraham and his descendants. In this respect, it surpasses immensely all other ancient cosmogonies. The apparent or real contradictions between the Bk. of Genesis and modern science refer only to details of order having no bearing on the spiritual life: see also §150. This knowledge of an intelligent Creator who has come near to man to save and bless was an all-important element in the unique spiritual superiority of Israel to all other nations, and in the needful preparation for the Gospel of Christ. Its influence is seen in Isa. 37^{16}, Jer. $10^{11, 12}$, Pss. 8^{3-8}, 19^{1}, Job 38^{4}: and it supplies, in the best possible way, a deep spiritual need of man.

The immense SUPERIORITY of the story of Creation in Gen. 1 and 2 to all similar works, *e.g.* the Assyrian Tablets, the Indian Rig-veda, Mand. x. 129, and the *Timæus* of Plato, can be accounted for only by a special revelation from God given to Israel only: and its spiritual value now even to Christians, its relation to the further revelations to Abraham,

through Moses to Israel, and in Christ to the world, and the absence of all polytheism and pantheism throughout the O.T., disclose in a special measure the guiding hand of God.

68. From the above we see that, just as the N.T. is a record of the supernatural and historical revelation given by God to men in Christ, so the O.T. is a record of similar revelations given to Israel and PREPARATORY to the supreme revelation given in Christ; that in both cases the record is substantially true, and sufficiently accurate for the purposes for which the revelations were given; and is due to a deliberate purpose of God. The O.T. falls below the N.T. only as the preparatory revelations fall below that given in Christ. The one reflects the day-dawn; the other, the sun-rise. In other words, each corresponds to the revelation therein recorded.

CHAPTER VIII

THE AUTHORITY OF THE BIBLE

69. THE following judgment touching the Bible as a whole and its place in the Kingdom of God, placed here for convenience before we begin our study of Christian Theology, will I think, as we proceed, commend itself.

The Bible consists of correct RECORDS and expositions of REVELATIONS, commands, and promises, spoken by God through the lips of Christ and through various earlier agencies, human and superhuman, preparatory to the fuller revelation in Christ; also of substantially correct records of FACTS needful to explain this teaching and to certify it as from God; and

re-echoes of it in HUMAN THOUGHT and life. The records are a sufficient statement and exposition of the Gospel, of the facts concerning it, and of earlier revelations leading up to it; and are a complete HISTORICAL PROOF of its divine origin. Without such records, Christ and the Gospel would not have become the Light and Life of all subsequent generations.

The records reproduce the revelations and facts as they were known and apprehended by the writers of the Bible. Consequently, they bear marks of HUMAN IMPERFECTION. But they are honest expressions of the writers' actual thoughts. Their harmony, and their difference from all other contemporary religious writings, prove them to be a truthful reflection of actual revelations from God, and a record of facts sufficiently correct for the purpose for which the revelations were given.

70. Parts of the O.T. claim expressly to have been written under a special influence of the SPIRIT OF GOD. The O.T. is frequently quoted in the N.T. as true history, as a decisive standard of what is true and right, and as a voice of the Spirit of God; and this opinion is attributed to CHRIST. It is most unlikely that in this matter the apostles were in serious error: and, whatever authority belongs to the O.T., no one can deny to the N.T. in at least equal degree. To this special INSPIRATION must be attributed the wonderful fitness of the words chosen to set forth the doctrines of the Gospel. If so, the inspiration extends even to (cp. 1 Cor. 2^{13}) the WORDS of Holy Scripture; not however as dictating them or making them infallible, but as enabling the writers to understand the revelations, and to choose suitable modes of recording them.

This special inspiration is NOT DISPROVED by any facts known to us within or without the Bible. For any internal

discrepancies, or discrepancies with external history or with Natural Science, have no bearing on the purpose for which the Bible was given; and are therefore not incompatible with a special divine influence enabling the Sacred Writers to set forth in suitable words the revelations from God to man. Nor is it disproved by any uncertainty about the authorship or date of some of the Sacred Documents. Such questions must be determined by sound historical criticism. Certain passages in the O.T. attributing to God commands which our moral sense cannot approve reveal in its writers an imperfect apprehension of the mind of God. But they are a true picture of the religious thought of the day in which they were written. The whole N.T. commands the homage of our moral sense.

Similarly, the references to Natural Science, *e.g.* Gen. 1, reflect the immature though intelligent thought of the age in which they were written; and were sufficiently accurate for the spiritual purposes the writers had in view.

71. In modern religious phraseology the Bible is often called "the WORD OF GOD." Unless carefully explained, this phrase is most unsafe. For it is common in the Bible, *e.g.* Gen. $15^{1, 4}$, Ps. $119^{9, 11, 16}$, Isa. 1^{10}, 2^{3}, 16^{13}; Mk. 7^{13}, Lk. 3^{2}, 5^{1}, $8^{11, 21}$, 11^{28}, Jno. 10^{35}, Acts 4^{31}, $6^{2, 7}$, $8^{14, 25}$, etc., but is never there used as a distinctive title of the sacred books. The modern use suggests that the Bible claims this title; which it does not. Moreover it suggests that God is responsible for every statement in the Bible, as a man is responsible for all that he has written; or, in other words, that every statement in the Bible is true in the sense intended by the human writer. Of this, we have no proof: and it is disproved by the discrepancies and moral difficulties mentioned in §§ 51 and 66. In other words, the phrase before us is not true of the Bible in the sense which it

at once suggests. Consequently, if used, it must be carefully guarded: and all phrases needing to be carefully guarded are dangerous.

Just so, the word INSPIRED is insufficient to distinguish the Bible from other books. For the whole spiritual life of man is lived in the guidance and power of the *Spirit* of God; and may therefore be justly called *inspired*. Indeed no description of inspiration in the Bible is stronger than that in Mt. 10^{20}; a promise valid for all the persecuted servants of Christ. It is very difficult to distinguish between this inspiration and that which guided the Sacred Writers in their unique work. The real DISTINCTION of the Bible from other books is in the unique NEARNESS of its writers to special supernatural and historical revelations from God to men culminating in the Gospel of Christ; in its unique place in God's PURPOSE of salvation; and in a unique INFLUENCE of the Spirit of God guiding and controlling them so as to secure through their agency a correct record of these revelations. As divinely-given records of divinely-given revelations, the books thus written stand alone above all other literature; and are therefore described in Rom. 1^{2}, 2 Tim. 3^{15f} as HOLY WRITINGS and SACRED LETTERS, GOD-BREATHED.

72. The above account of the place of the Bible in Christian thought differs essentially from that prevalent during the middle of the last century. Most writers on the subject endeavoured to prove that the Bible is the inspired word of God, and therefore an INFALLIBLE STATEMENT of actual facts and of truth revealed by God to men; and, on the platform thus set up, they or other writers proceeded to erect a heavy structure of theological doctrine.

Of this theory of the INERRANCY OF THE BIBLE, the best and perhaps latest representative is a volume by Archdeacon

Lee, entitled *The Inspiration of the Bible*, 1st ed. 1854, 5th ed. 1882, from which last I quote. In the "Recapitulation" in lect. viii. p. 388, he writes: "Thus far I have endeavoured to lay down principles from which the divine authority, the infallible certainty, the entire truthfulness, of every part of the Scriptures must necessarily result." Again, on p. 393f: "I repeat that if we fully and entirely believe in the divine origin of Holy Scripture, to assert that its statements do not harmonize is a contradiction in terms." Of this opinion, he gives in lect. vi. "Scriptural Proof," prefacing it by 1 Cor. 2^{13}. His only arguments are that the writers of the Bible claim in their writings supernatural help, that a correct record was needful for the purposes for which the revelations were given, and that in the Bible the needful accuracy is actually found. But supernatural inspiration does not necessarily imply infallibility in all details; nor is such infallibility needful for the purposes for which the revelations were given. Moreover Dr. Lee's treatment of discrepancies is most unsatisfactory. Those mentioned by me in § 51 are passed over in silence; as are the serious moral difficulties in § 66. The whole theory rests, not on careful examination of what the Bible actually is, but on reasoning about what a divinely-given record of divinely-given revelations ought to be. Such reasoning is a most insecure foundation for a System of Theology.

73. The CANON of O T. and N.T. is the list of books which justly claim a place in the first rank of the sacred writings of Jews and Christians. It implies that certain books stand above all others in a place of unique superiority. The question of *canonicity* is the claim of any document to a place in this front rank. Of such ancient lists, the Fragment of Muratori (§§ 34, 36, 38,) is the best known example.

In the method followed in this volume, the question of canonicity is lost in that of genuineness and date and value. For some books outside the list are of more value to us than others within it; *e.g.* the *Wisdom of Solomon* as compared with *Ecclesiastes*, and the *Ep. of Clement* as compared with 2 Peter. For our conclusions rest, not on some infallible authority, but upon the agreement of many witnesses of which each has been tested as we should test any other historical documents. As matter of research, the books of the N.T. are our earliest and best witnesses about Christ and His teaching. But we gladly welcome later witnesses; and we find in them valuable confirmation of the earlier records.

An authoritative list of books would require an infallible Church to mark out its limits. To us, such distinction, in O.T. or N.T., is needless.

CHAPTER IX

SUGGESTIONS FOR STUDY

74. THE foregoing account of the Christian Records determines the correct method of theological research. For in them we have found a GROUP OF credible WITNESSES touching the life and teaching of Christ. These witnesses, we must examine by careful consecutive study of the documents in which they speak to us. We must endeavour, while tracing the line of thought of each document, to reconstruct the writer's conception of Christ and the Gospel. In the case of Paul, a number of letters written in different circumstances will lay open to us not only his thought

but successive stages of its development. The variety of writers in the N.T. will enable us to eliminate the peculiarities of each, and thus to reach the actual teaching of Christ and in some measure the eternal realities about which He spoke.

75. We shall soon learn to discriminate in the N.T. different types of teaching. One very definite type, we shall find in the letters which we have already traced to the pen of PAUL. This will give us the Gospel as it was understood by the most conspicuous of the early followers of Christ. Another definite type, differing both in thought and phrase from that of Paul yet in deep underlying harmony with it, we shall find in the Gospel and First Epistle of JOHN, documents which we have good reason to accept as coming directly or indirectly from an intimate associate of Jesus. A third definite type of teaching, we shall find in the SYNOPTIC GOSPELS, which seem to embody the ordinary public teaching of Christ. Other witnesses are found in the other N.T. books. The evidence afforded by these various witnesses, we shall, as we pass along, consider and compare. In them we shall find, testing them as we should any other ancient documents, complete rational certainty touching the life and work and teaching of the Founder of Christianity.

In other words, we can see Christ and grasp His teaching only as these are reflected in the minds of His earliest followers, and as their thoughts about Him find permanent expression in their extant writings: cp. 2 Cor. 3^{18}, 1 Cor. 13^{12}. We have no right to assume that these mirrors are perfect. But the profound harmony underlying the mental images thus produced, amid differences caused by different points of view, assures us that they reflect reality. Through these harmonious reflections in the thoughts of fallible men, the living personality of the Son of God reveals Himself to us.

We shall occasionally compare the teaching of Christ with that of the EARLIER TEACHERS OF HIS OWN NATION. Their language will frequently explain that of the N.T.: and in the O.T. we shall find germs of doctrines, afterwards more fully developed in the Gospel. A comparison of the Old and New, in their similarities and differences, will reveal the immense and transforming influence of the teaching of Christ on the religious thought of His nation and of the world.

We shall also compare the religious teaching of OTHER ANCIENT LITERATURE. This will enable us to appreciate the special historical revelations given to Israel. And in it we shall sometimes find influences which moulded the form of the Gospel of Christ.

This comparison will mark off three stages in the religious development of mankind: (*a*) the *Gentile*, with only the revelation given in the material universe, and in the moral sense, and in the social life, of man; (*b*) the preparatory historical revelation given to Israel; and (*c*) the supreme revelation given to mankind in Christ. See further in § 86.

76. This method of research is thoroughly SCIENTIFIC and PHILOSOPHICAL. For it rests ultimately on observed matters of fact; and is in harmony with the principles of human certainty touching matters which have not come under our own observation: and it uses ascertained facts as avenues of approach to broad principles. In its earlier stages, it will be GRAMMATICAL and HISTORICAL. We shall try to understand the meaning of words proved, by strictly historical evidence, to have been written by Paul or his contemporaries. We shall thus reproduce his actual thoughts about the work and teaching of Christ: and by comparing these with the writings of others, we shall endeavour to reach the actual teaching of Christ. We shall meet with important statements of fact; and these we shall test by historical evidence. The

moral teaching of Christ will appeal at once to our moral sense: and His entire teaching will find wonderful verification in its effect on the heart and life of man.

77. This main outline of research requires the aid of several other departments of knowledge. Already, in § 42, I have referred to Textual Criticism. Still more important is the GRAMMAR and LEXICOGRAPHY of the GREEK TESTAMENT and a competent knowledge of its language. For frequently important theological teaching is embodied in a grammatical inflection or in the meaning of a word. The best version is only a dark glass hiding much of the writer's thought, and especially his allusions, and thus obscuring and weakening his line of argument. He who is dependent upon it hears the words of Christ and His Apostles from a distance too great to permit him, in much of the N.T., to follow their train of thought. Certainly every one set to be a teacher in the Church is bound to do all he can to read the N.T. in the language in which it was written.

Fortunately this language is very easy. Its vocabulary is small, and its grammar simple and beautiful. Every student may attain such knowledge of it as will enable him to gain from the N.T. a broader, deeper, and more accurate view of things eternal than is otherwise possible. The same is true, but in much less degree, of the language of the Old Testament.

Specially helpful is a study of the WORDS and PHRASES of the Bible. As examples I may refer to the words *justify*, *faith*, and *holy* in §§ 170, 176, 262ff; and to the phrase *in Christ* in § 295.

In this work, all quotations are taken from the original, translated so as to elucidate the point in view.

Our research will also lay under contribution a knowledge, not only of the sacred languages, but of the SCIENCES

OF LANGUAGE and THOUGHT, and of the relation of language to thought. And, as we have seen in chs. 1 and 4, the HISTORY of nations and even GEOLOGY and CHEMISTRY contribute to this highest department of human knowledge.

For helps needful in study of the Bible, see Appendix.

78. From the above will appear the position in theological research of works like the present. A knowledge of Theology, *i.e.* an intelligent conception of the great unseen foundations of religion, can as little and as much be derived from modern THEOLOGICAL WORKS as can a knowledge of Botany from books on Botany. In each case, for a reliable and comprehensive grasp of the subject, there must be personal contact with the facts, and as nearly as possible with all the facts, on which the science rests. For theology, there must be patient consecutive study of the Christian documents, careful observation of the material world and of the social life around, and an inward experience of the salvation announced by Christ. Indeed, whatever pertains to man will teach us, directly or indirectly, something about the unseen Realities which underlie all human life. On the other hand, observed facts are of use to us only so far as we interpret their significance as exponents of great principles. Our success in this effort to read the meaning of that which our eyes see is the measure of our knowledge. And, in our effort to do so, we shall welcome eagerly the aid of other observers as embodied in theological works.

79. Theological research, on the lines just marked out, will be a rich MEANS OF SPIRITUAL GROWTH. For it will bring us into close mental and spiritual contact not only with the immediate followers of Christ, the men who gained for him the homage of mankind, but with the great Teacher Himself. We shall sit at the feet of apostles and evangelists, and of Christ: and, listening to them and to Him, we shall

look into those eternal realities which the Incarnate Son has manifested to men and by them be lifted above the passing things around into personal intercourse with our Father in heaven.

Such study will also be the best preparation for the work of saving the lost and of training disciples in the school of Christ. For, what we have ourselves seen and heard, we shall be moved by the love of Him who died for all men to proclaim to all who will hear us.

80. In this research, the TRADITIONAL knowledge of things divine, which forms the intellectual and spiritual atmosphere of the Church of Christ, will greatly help us. For it conveys, in familiar modes of thought, the primary doctrines of the Gospel. But this traditional knowledge needs to be supplemented and corrected by accurate and consecutive study of the sacred documents. For, valuable as it is, this theological tradition, unless thus guarded, may seriously cripple the free and healthy development of our own independent thought, and thus prevent the growth of intelligent convictions of our own. These last are the only sure foundation of religion, and the only sufficient armament of the Christian teacher. Another needful safeguard is the verification, in our own spiritual life, of the theology learnt from the Bible.

Some earnest Christian workers have feared Biblical research lest critical inquiry should weaken the old beliefs which have been their own joy and strength. Undoubtedly some scholars have abandoned essential elements of the Gospel. But a living faith cannot be maintained by a mere clinging to traditions of the past. The surest defence of the historic faith is a more searching, yet reverent, examination of the sacred documents. This volume will prove how little we have to fear from such inquiry.

81. My quotations from the Bible DO NOT imply the

INFALLIBLE AUTHORITY of each passage quoted; any more than quotations in historical works imply the infallibility of the authorities adduced. In each case, the value of the authorities must be estimated by the student himself. That the N.T. gives a correct account of the life and teaching of Christ, we shall learn as we proceed, with intelligent certainty, from the close agreement of the many witnesses who speak to us from its pages. This agreement renders needless an assumption of the infallibility of any one writer. In chs. 11f and 26f, good examples are given of the kind of argument on which my conclusions rest.

A result of this method is that some doctrines will be found to rest on evidence MUCH broader and FIRMER than any which can be adduced for some other doctrines. To distinguish between these different degrees of certainty is of utmost importance. It will be found that the doctrines which have most divided Churches can claim only very scanty evidence; and that those which rest on abundant and decisive evidence are accepted by a large majority of the best writers of all Churches, and have been everywhere and always the richest nutriment of the spiritual life.

PART IV

THE FATHER, SON, AND SPIRIT

CHAPTER X

GOD OUR FATHER

82. In ch. 1. we found, clearly impressed on the MATERIAL UNIVERSE teeming with life, vegetable, animal, and human, footprints of an intelligent Creator. In the inborn MORAL SENSE and in the manifest sequence of action and retribution, we found also proof that the Maker of men has marked out a moral path along which he would have them go and in which path only they can attain their highest welfare. The resources of the Creator, we see in the visible universe: and in the phenomena of the moral life we hear the voice of a righteous Lawgiver who will recompense every man according to his action.

83. All this is asserted and implied in plainest language throughout the OLD TESTAMENT. In Gen. 1 we see the world and man rising into being, step by step, at the bidding of one supreme Intelligence. The same is formally and conspicuously asserted in Ex. 20^{11}, at a great crisis in the history of Israel. In Ex. 7–14 we find the forces of nature used by God to work out Israel's deliverance; and even the heart of Pharaoh hardened by Him. That the God of Abraham is the one CREATOR of the universe and that in His hands are all powers on earth, natural and personal, is throughout the O.T. an important element in the religion of Israel: cp. 2 Kgs. $19^{15\text{-}19}$, Isa. 42^{5}, Ps. $8^{3\text{-}8}$. In all this we

notice, amid various and composite documents of various dates, no signs of development or tolerance of Polytheism. In the Decalogue, which is probably one of the earliest parts of the O.T., the doctrine of one intelligent Creator is as clearly stated as in the later books.

The Creator is also the righteous RULER of men. In Gen. 2, He forbids to man the fruit of one of the trees of the garden; and attaches a penalty to disobedience. He pronounces on the first murderer a tremendous sentence: and throughout the historical, prophetic, and other books, He is ever represented as recompensing men and nations according to their actions good or bad. Absolute justice to all men everywhere is a constant attribute of the God of Israel: and He is faithful and true in the fulfilment of both promises and threatenings.

Another conspicuous feature in the O.T. is the GOODNESS and MERCY of God. He is ever the Friend and Helper and Saviour of all who put trust in and obey Him. His hands are full of blessing and His merciful ear is open to the cry of the distressed. Although He is the covenanted God of Abraham and of Israel, it is worthy of note that the blessings promised to Abraham are designed to reach to all the families of the earth.

In this clear and confident knowledge of ONE PERSONAL GOD, the Creator of all things yet absolutely distinct from all that He has made, the righteous Ruler of all men and the Helper of all who seek and obey Him, the O.T. is conspicuously superior to all other pre-Christian literature. This superiority is seen in the spiritual helpfulness of the O.T. in all ages and to all sorts of people, even to those who have learnt most in the school of Christ. From this point of view there can be no greater contrast than that between the O.T. and the Gentile teaching quoted in chs. 1 and 2. This

contrast has no parallel in literature; and can be accounted for only by a special revelation from God to Israel, not given to other nations of antiquity.

84. An attribute of God almost peculiar to the Bible is His HOLINESS. In Lv. 11^{44}, 19^{2}, 20^{26}, 21^{8}, He solemnly calls Himself *holy*; and on this ground bids His people to *sanctify* themselves and to be holy: cp. Lv. 10^{3}, Num. 20^{12}, 27^{14}, Dt. 32^{51}. We have the holiness of God in Pss. 22^{3}, $99^{5.\ 9}$, etc.; and in Isa. 1^{4}, 5^{19}, 41^{14}, etc., "the Holy One of Israel." It is impossible to give to the word *holy* here any meaning radically different from its meaning when applied (see ch. 32) to the various *holy* objects of the Old Covenant. Inevitably the holiness of God would recall the holy things and men so familiar to Israel; the more so because all these holy objects stood in special relation to God. We therefore ask, What do the sacred things of the Mosaic Covenant teach us about God? What definite element in His nature do they reveal?

The answer is not far to seek. To Moses, Aaron, and Israel, encamped around the Sacred Tent, God was the great Being who had claimed from Aaron a peculiar and exclusive and lifelong service. This claim must have created an era in Aaron's conception of God. By predicating of Himself the word *holy* familiarly applied to various visible objects claimed for His use, God taught that this claim was an outflow and expression of His own nature, of a definite element in God. He was now the God of the altar, the tabernacle, the priesthood, the sacrifices, the sabbath, the holy nation. The holiness of God is that in Him of which these are visible exponents. In other words, by calling Himself *holy*, God proclaimed that in virtue of His own nature, and of the essential relation of the Creator to His creatures, He can do no other than claim their unreserved

devotion, and that in this devotion He can tolerate no rival. The holiness of God thus stands closely related to His JEALOUSY: so Jos. 24^{19}, where the two ideas are put side by side; also Ex. 20^{5}, 34^{14}, Dt. 4^{24}, 5^{9}, 6^{15}.

The N.T. use of the word *holy* (see § 270) as a designation of the servants of Christ places the new life in Christ in relation to the holy objects of the Old Covenant. By calling themselves *holy*, they recognised that God had claimed them to be exclusively His own, in order that He may be henceforth the one aim of their every purpose and effort. The servants of Christ are a temple, a priesthood; and their bodies a living sacrifice. For God claims (*e.g.* 2 Cor. 5^{15}) that they live a life of unreserved devotion to Him.

All this involves a new and very solemn conception of God. He is to us now the great Being who has claimed all that we have and are, to be His own. And when He who has thus sanctified us in Christ calls Himself *holy*, we learn that this claim flows from His nature, that in virtue of His mode of existence He can do no other than claim to be the sole possessor of all that He has created, and the one aim of the entire activity of all His intelligent creatures. Similarly, creation is an outflow of the inmost nature of God: for He can do no other than create. All things are *from* Him and *for* Him.

The holiness of God is that essential element of His nature which moved Him to claim in symbolic outline the sacred objects of the Mosaic ritual; and which moves Him to claim the unreserved devotion of all His intelligent creatures. He is the Beginning, and claims to be the End.

In virtue of His holiness, God is an enemy to all sin. For sin is disloyalty to Him, and robs Him of that which He cannot but claim. So far as we are holy, shall we be

sharers of this divine hostility to sin. Thus the holiness of God involves, but is much more than, His purity.

All this explains Lv. 11^{44}, where in strong language God supports His claim to forbid to Israel certain kinds of food as unclean by asserting that this claim is an outflow of His essence, and that consequently to refuse to obey is to set oneself against God Himself. Similarly, but on an infinitely higher plane, in 1 Peter. 1^{15f} the readers are bidden to yield to God, in all the turnings and movements of life, unreserved devotion as His servants.

Elsewhere in the N.T. the holiness of God is mentioned only in Jno. 17^{11}, Heb. 12^{10}, Rev. 4^{8} (cp. Isa. 6^{3}), and Rev. 6^{10}. But it is involved in the holiness of His servants. In the N.T. it is overshadowed by His central attribute of love.

85. A conspicuous element of the teaching of Christ and of Paul, in contrast (cp. Isa. 63^{16}, Mal. 1^{6}, 2^{10}) to the O.T., is that God is our FATHER: Mt. $5^{16,\ 45,\ 48}$, $6^{1,\ 4,\ 6,\ 8,\ 9,\ 14,\ 15,\ 18,\ 26,\ 32}$, etc., Jno. 20^{17}, Rom. 1^{7}, 8^{15}, 1 Cor. 1^{3}, 8^{6}, Gal. 1^{4}, 4^{6}, Eph. 1^{2}, 3^{14}, 4^{6}, etc. Indisputably, we owe to Christ this new and conspicuous conception of God. This teaching makes every form of fatherly excellence among men a mirror reflecting, amid human imperfection, the infinite nature of God. It reveals in God a father's heart which, in virtue of His relation to us as the Source of our being, loves and yearns for His children on earth; and it assures us that, from His infinite resources, He will provide for, and protect, us. The universe, we now learn, is our Father's house: and in the love of Him who holds all things in His hands, His children rest.

Involved in the Fatherhood of God, and very conspicuous in the N.T., is His LOVE to man: so Jno. 3^{16}, 1 Jno. 4^{10}, Rom. 5^{8}, Eph. 2^{4}, etc. The supreme manifestation of this love is that God gave up to die for men One whom in ch. 11 we shall find to be a Partner of His eternal glory.

Only when the eternal Son appeared in human form was this manifestation of divine love possible.

This teaching culminates in 1 Jno. $4^{8, 16}$, where, describing the love manifested in the mission of His Son, we read twice that GOD IS LOVE. These great words give to Love a unique place among the moral attributes of God as the one quality worthy to describe God Himself. Righteousness and truth are only partial elements included in the all-embracing attribute of love: for, to be unrighteous or untruthful, is unloving. Moreover, not every act of God springs from His righteousness or truth; but all that God does is an outflow of infinite love. He created man in order to have created objects worthy of His utmost love: foreseeing that this would eventually lead to the death of His own Son. Deliberately to create man, under such circumstances, is a manifestation of the love of God, the most wonderful we can conceive.

Love is the central attribute of God. The other moral attributes are but the same attribute seen from various limited points of view. The natural attributes describe the infinite resources at the disposal of infinite love. These resources, love needs for its full manifestation. In God we have infinite love armed with infinite wisdom and power.

This conception of God is the loftiest and most attractive known to man. We see in Him an intelligent and self-determining Being, with unlimited resources, the Source of whatever in the universe is good, calling into existence (§ 341) other intelligent and self-determining beings, finite copies of Himself; and using all His resources to do them good. His WISDOM, we see in His selection of the noblest purpose we can conceive, viz. the rescue of perishing men and the erection, from the materials thus saved, of the eternal Kingdom of God; and in the selection of the best

means for attaining this glorious end. His supernatural POWER, we shall see in the resurrection of Christ from the dead ; and in the moral influences which draw men to Christ, rescue them from the dominion of their own sins, and endow them with new moral strength.

86. Notice now, plainly marked on the pages of the Bible as compared with contemporary literature, THREE STAGES (§ 75) in the knowledge of God. (1) In all ages and nations, the best men have found in the material world indications more or less clear of an intelligent Creator, and have heard in the moral sense of men the voice of a righteous Ruler who will give back to every one according to his works. (2) To Israel, the Creator and Ruler, who was ever in the thought of the nation in a measure to which no other nation affords a parallel, revealed Himself as their covenanted God, the Friend and Helper of all who seek and obey Him, and as claiming from His people undivided service. (3) And no fact in the religious history of the world is more certain than that Jesus of Nazareth taught that God is the loving Father of all who accept the salvation announced by Christ. In their Father in heaven they see one whose Name and Nature are Love.

CHAPTER XI

THE SON OF GOD: HIS SUPERHUMAN DIGNITY

87. IN Jno. 20^{31} we read, "These things have been written in order that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, THE SON OF GOD." The significance of this title, conspicuous throughout the N.T., we will now consider.

In Lk. 1^{35}, it was given to Jesus before His birth by an angel: and in ch. 2^{49} the Sacred Boy speaks of God as "My Father." In Mt. 3^{17}, Mk. 1^{11}, Lk. 3^{22}, a voice from heaven proclaims Him "My beloved Son." In the temptation, the question at issue is whether He is "the Son of God:" Mt. $4^{3,6}$, Lk. $4^{3,9}$. In Mt. 16^{16}, at an important turning point in His teaching, He accepts from Peter the same title. Important evidence about its significance is found in Mt. 21^{33ff}, Mk. 12^{1ff}, Lk. 20^{9ff}. After several servants have been put to death or ill-used, the master resolves to send his son, assured that none will dare to injure him. The "servants" can be no other than the teachers who preceded Christ, perhaps with special reference to John the Baptist. In other words, Christ here claims to be as much above the prophets as the master's son is above the highest of his servants. The same contrast is conspicuous in Heb. 1^{2}, $3^{5,6}$. Notice also Mt. 8^{29}, 14^{33}, 17^{5}, 26^{63}, $27^{40,43,54}$.

Same title in Jno. $1^{34,50}$, $11^{4,27}$. In ch. $3^{16,18}$, 1 Jno. 4^{9}, (cp. Jno. 1^{4},) we have the title ONLY-BEGOTTEN SON, (cp. Mk. 12^{6},) implying a unique relation to God, and suggesting a unique mode of derivation from Him. So also Rom. $1^{3,4}$, $5^{6\text{-}10}$; and a still stronger term, HIS OWN SON, in ch. $8^{3,32}$. Cp. Gal. 1^{16}, 2^{20}, 4^{4}, 1 Cor. 1^{9}, 15^{28}, 2 Cor. 1^{19}, Eph. 4^{13}, Col. 1^{13}, 1 Th. 1^{10}.

The agreement of these various witnesses proves decisively that Jesus actually claimed to be in a unique sense *the Son of God*. The analogy of human sonship suggests at once a person derived from another distinct yet similar person. Consequently, this claim of Christ suggests or implies that in some sense He is derived from the Father, but in a mode essentially different from that by which we sprang, in the image of God, from the Creator's hands.

88. In Mt. 7^{23}, 13^{41}, 16^{27}, 24^{31}, 25^{31ff} Christ claims to be the future JUDGE OF THE WORLD. In Jno. 5^{28f} He asserts that at His voice all the dead will go forth to judgment. That even Paul will stand at His bar, we read in 2 Cor. 5^{10}: so Rom. 2^{16}, Acts 17^{31}. He will, when He comes from heaven, transform the bodies of His servants: Ph. 3^{21}. A remarkable anticipation of all this is found in Dan. 7^{13f}, where endless dominion is given to "One like a son of man," who is distinguished from "the Ancient of Days."

The parallel in Rom 5^{12-19}, 1 Cor. $15^{22, 45}$, making Christ the Last ADAM, places Him infinitely above all the descendants of Adam who share their father's fall and in some sense his sin. In Jno. 1^{3}, Col. 1^{16f} we read that through His agency came into being whatever began to be, including the successive ranks in heaven, Himself earlier than, and embracing, all things: cp. Jno. 8^{58}, $17^{5, 24}$. That Christ is, as we read in Col. 1^{18}, Eph. 1^{22}, 4^{16}, 5^{23f}, the HEAD of the Church, which is His BODY, and by another metaphor His BRIDE, reveals his unique and infinite superiority to all His servants: as does the teaching, *e.g.* Rom. 8^{10}, Gal. 2^{20}, Rom. 8^{1}, 2 Cor. 5^{17}, that He lives IN them, and they IN Him. In Mt. 11^{27-30}, Christ claims that, in a religious nation, He only and those taught by Him know God; and calls to Himself all the weary and burdened and promises to give them rest by laying upon them His yoke. In ch. 28^{19f}, "the Son" is closely associated with "the Father:" and the Risen One, who has just commissioned His followers to disciple all the nations, encourages them by saying, "I am with you always, even to the completion of the age," thus claiming for Himself omnipresence. Such stupendous claim and promise were never made by or for any other man.

In Rev. 5^{6-14}, we see in the midst of the THRONE, as

an object of the praises and worship of all who surround it, a slain Lamb: so chs. 1^{5f}, 7^{17}, cp. 21^{22}, 22^{1}. Yet in chs. 19^{10}, 22^{9}, the prophet is bidden to worship only God. The whole book raises Christ infinitely above the highest and brightest in heaven, and places Him in closest relation to God.

89. In Jno. 5^{18} we read that the Jews sought to kill Christ because He "called God His own Father," making Himself "equal to God." In ch. 10^{33}, they charge Him. "Thou, being a man, art making thyself God:" cp. Ph. 2^{6}. In Jno. 20^{28}, after His resurrection, Christ accepts from Thomas the august title, unheard before as applied to Himself, "my Lord and my God." The evangelist who records these words asserts in ch. $1^{1\text{-}3}$ that "the Word was GOD;" and that by His agency all things were made. This last universal assertion defines *v.*[1] to mean that in the beginning of whatever *began to be* the Word *existed*. Notice the marked contrast of ἦν and ἐγένετο, in *vv.*[1. 3. 14]. The only interpretation these words admit is that the Word existed without beginning from eternity. From *vv.* [14-17], we learn that the Word is Jesus Christ.

This interpretation cannot be set aside by the occasional use of the word *god* in a lower sense, as in Ps. 82^{6}, 1 Cor. 8^{5}. For the word is never so used where there is the slightest risk of confounding this use with its ordinary and loftier sense. The context here removes all doubt. The appeal in Jno. 10^{34} was evidently designed simply to silence opponents. Christ shows at once in *v.*[35f] that He can claim a title far higher than could the men referred to in Ps. 82.

For the meaning of Rom. 9^{5}, see note in my *Commentary*.

90. The above quotations sketch in scanty outline the PROFOUND IMPRESSION made by the Founder of Christianity

in the minds and hearts of His earliest followers. They prove that all those whose opinions have come down to us, including a former colleague of His murderers, a man of keen intelligence and calm judgment, looked up to a fellow countryman of their own day as infinitely greater than the greatest of men, greater than the venerated leaders of ancient Israel, greater and earlier than the earliest and loftiest archangel, and as occupying a position of unique superiority to everything created, and of unique nearness to God. Such homage was never paid, before or since, by man to man. We shall soon see that the conception of the dignity of Christ involved in the above teaching will modify greatly our CONCEPTION of GOD Himself. And we shall be compelled to judge whether in this conception of Christ and of God the early disciples who won for Him the homage of all future ages were in error, or whether the honour paid by them to Christ was actually and justly claimed by Him.

CHAPTER XII

THE SON'S RELATION TO THE FATHER

91. THAT in Jno. 1^1, the Word, who was with God in the beginning and who afterwards became flesh as Jesus Christ, is called GOD, implies that He shares with the Father those attributes which DISTINGUISH God from man: and $v.^3$ suggests irresistibly that, whereas we and the universe began to be, He exists without beginning. This is also the only explanation of the unique mode of derivation

from the Father implied in Jno. 3^{16}, Mk. 12^{6}, etc.: for, if He was with God from the beginning, then is His relation to the Father different in kind from that of us whom God created. So, in Col. 1^{15}, He is, not the *firstcreated*, but the "*Firstborn* in relation to every creature." Thus the unique title *Son of God* implies an ETERNAL SON.

That the Son is EQUAL TO GOD, is in Jno. $5^{18\text{-}20}$ said to be implied in His claim that God is His "own Father:" and this claim He supports by asserting that, whatever things the Father does, He shows to the Son and the Son does them in like manner. It is also implied in Jno. 14^{9}, where Christ says that He is Himself an adequate manifestation of God, making needless other manifestation; and still more definitely in ch. 16^{15}, "All things, so many as the Father has, are mine." Equality is also implied in Ph. 2^{6}; where see note in my *Commentary*.

All this implies that the Son shares with the Father His infinite power, knowledge, wisdom, holiness, and love. And this equality with God, in all He has and is, save only His supreme Fatherhood, is the only explanation of the language used by Christ and about Christ throughout the N.T. On Jno. 14^{28}, see § 96.

92. It has been suggested that Jesus was equal to God only in the sense that in Him was MANIFESTED in created human form the full moral grandeur and the wisdom and power of God. This would be, not two divine Persons, Companions from eternity, but one created human person in unique and immediate relation to the one Divine Person: see § 120. That this was not the conception of Paul and John, will soon appear.

In Jno. $1^{1,\ 14,\ 17}$, the evangelist traces up the personality of "Jesus Christ" to the beginning of time and declares that He then existed "with God." This cannot mean

simply that some divine *Reason* or *Utterance*, as we choose to expound the term *Word*, took personal form in Jesus. For this would not explain *v.*[3], "by His agency all things were made:" and evidently the writer's purpose is, not to magnify some attribute of God as the means of creation, but to do honour to Jesus. He here asserts in plainest language that all things were made by the agency of One closely associated with, but other than, the Father. So in Col. 1[16], after speaking of "the Son of His Love," who is Firstborn before every creature," Paul says that "in Him" and "through Him and for Him" were all things created in heaven and earth; and goes on to call Him "the Head of the Church" and "Firstborn from the dead." This implies clearly that He who was afterwards raised from the dead was the instrumental Cause of the creation of the universe. This implies a personality DISTINCT from the Father and earlier than the birth of Christ.

In the prayer of Christ to God in Jno. 17[5], One Person says to Another that before the world was THEY Two shared the same "glory;" and in *v.*[24] the Son says to the Father, "Thou LOVEDST Me before the foundation of the world." Now love implies two persons. For self-love is a contradiction in terms, or at least an infinitely lower use of the same word. But this lower use cannot be tolerated as describing the mutual and eternal love of the Father and the Son. For that love is the divine archetype of Christ's love to us, and of our love for each other: so Jno. 15[9, 10], 17[23, 24]. This comparison implies that the Father's love for the Son before the world was is the love of one Person for Another. Thus in the eternal love of the Father for the Son, held up by Christ as the pattern of His own love for man and of the mutual love of His servants, we see reflected the faces of Two divine Persons, the Eternal Father and the Eternal Son.

Moreover, this personal distinction is clearly implied in the comparison, in ch. $17^{11, 22}$, of the unity of the Father and Son with the mutual unity of the servants of Christ: for these last are indisputably distinct persons.

This essential distinction of Father and Son finds unexpected confirmation in Mt. 28^{19}, "in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit." This suggests irresistibly two other Persons distinct from the Father, who is Himself indisputably a Person.

In the above quotations, divine prerogatives are claimed for Christ, not on the ground of the close relation of His human nature to the divine nature of the Father, but on the ground of a superhuman nature distinct from the personality of the Father. They imply that with the Father in eternity is One distinct from Himself, yet sharing to the full His infinite power and wisdom and love.

93. Although throughout the N.T. the Son is represented as sharing to the full the divine attributes of the Father, the title *God* is, except in Jno. 1^{1}, 20^{28}, and perhaps Heb. 1^{8}, RESERVED FOR THE FATHER, even as distinguished from the Son. So 1 Cor. 8^{6}, Rom. 16^{27}, Jno. 17^{3}, Mk. 10^{18}. This reservation is explained by the conspicuous SUBORDINATION of the Son to the Father in 1 Cor. 3^{23}, 11^{3}, 15^{28}; Jno. $5^{19\text{-}23}$. In chs. 5^{26}, 6^{57}, this subordination is traced to a DERIVATION of the life of the Son from the Father. And indeed the title *Son of God* used so frequently throughout the N.T. suggests at once subordination resting upon derivation. For the chief idea suggested by the familiar terms *son* and *father* is personal existence and powers derived from another person.

Evidently the term *Son of God* describes a relation of the pre-existent and eternal Son to the Father. For the negation in Jno. 5^{19} denies to the entire personality of Christ all self-prompted action. Moreover, *v.*^{20} implies an intelligence

able to appreciate the entire activity of God, and therefore infinite. The whole chapter suggests, and keeps before us, an essential relation of the Son to the Father. Similarly, 1 Jno. 4^9, Rom. 8^3 imply that before His human birth Christ was the own and only Son of God. All this leaves no room for doubt that Jno. 5^{26}, 6^{57} assert the derivation of the divine life of the Son from the Father.

94. We now ask, To what extent may we TRANSFER to the Son of God IDEAS derived from human sonship? Evidently in an Eternal Father and Eternal Son, ideas of older and younger can have no place. As we lift up the conception of sonship out of time into eternity, these elements of it, ever present in human fathers and sons, at once disappear. What then remains? The chief idea remains, viz. personal life derived from the similar life of another person. And this idea is plainly embodied in Jno. 5^{26}, and in other express assertions from the lips of Christ describing His own relation to God.

Derivation does not necessarily imply LATER origin. Rays of light go forth from the sun to-day; and similar rays went forth a thousand years ago. It would not be difficult to our thought to conceive the same sun and sunshine 10,000 years ago; or to push them back indefinitely into the past. In other words, we can think of derivation without any thought of earlier or later. So may we think of Him whose relation to the Father is described in Heb. 1^3 as an "outshining of His glory." To grasp fully this relation, is far beyond our powers. But I see nothing incongruous in the conception of an eternal STREAM flowing forth from an eternal FOUNTAIN. And some such conception is required by the abundant language of Paul and of each of the Four Gospels about the relation of Jesus to His Father in heaven. We may conceive the Father as existing from eternity and possessing

infinite powers, simply because He wills so to exist, without any cause external to Himself, eternal and infinite and underived; and the Son as existing with the Father from eternity and possessing to the full the Father's infinite powers, but these derived from the Father, existing because the Father wills Him so to exist, eternal and infinite and DERIVED. We are born in time, finite, and derived.

95. An exact counterpart of the Son's derivation from the Father, and a very conspicuous element in His subordination, is the Son's DEVOTION to the Father. Just as from the Father the Son derives all that He has and is, so, to fulfil the Father's purposes, is the one aim of the entire activity of the Son. This unreserved devotion finds expression in Jno. 4^{34}, 6^{38}, 17^{4}; and in Rom. 6^{10}. "He lives for God," *i.e.* to accomplish His purposes. See further in §§ 274–276.

96. The above passages give us an harmonious conception of the relation of the Son to the Father. In the Son we see an eternal Stream flowing back in full volume to its Source. We see an infinite and eternal Life derived from an infinite and eternal Life, the derived Life being in complete harmony with its Source, and tending ever to accomplish the purposes of the original Life. This conception explains the use throughout the N.T. of the phrase *Son of God*; and accounts for the reservation to the Father, except in two or three conspicuous exceptions, of the supreme title *God*, and for the constant subordination, along with a claim to equality, of the Son to the Father.

This subordination of the Son to the Father is the easiest explanation of Jno. 14^{28}, "the Father is GREATER than I." That this is found in the Fourth Gospel, along with the above passages, suggests that any contradiction between it and them is only apparent. The harmony is not far to seek. The Son is equal to the Father in everything except His supreme

Fatherhood. He is equal in that the Son shares to the full the Father's existence without beginning, and His infinite power and wisdom and love. But because the Father possesses these divine attributes from Himself alone, whereas the Son possesses them as derived from the Father, in this real sense and in this sense only the Father is greater than the Son. This SUPERIORITY was a reason why the disciples should rejoice that their Master was going to the Father. For, in harmony with His nature the eternal Stream was ascending to its eternal Source.

97. As Himself distinct from, and derived from, the Father, the Son is the eternal ARCHETYPE of all created being, and especially of all intelligent creatures. We therefore wonder not that He is Himself the Agent of creation. For, in His eternal relation to the Father before time began, lay the possibility of creatures derived from and distinct from God. The created universe is an unfolding, under the limitations of time, of that which in its germ lay hidden in the derived, yet eternal and unlimited, existence of the Son of God. He is (Rev. 3^{14}) "the Beginning of the creation of God."

In § 294 we shall find that the Son of God is also the PATTERN for all intelligent creatures. His unreserved devotion to the Father is the model they are bound to imitate: and only so far as they do so is the aim of their being accomplished. In other words, in the Godhead we find, before time began, both archetype and pattern for all intelligent creatures.

98. In conspicuous contrast to prevalent polytheism, all the O.T. writers (see § 83) assume and assert the UNITY of God. To them, the God of Israel is the one Creator and Controller of the universe and the one Moral Ruler of mankind. This unity of God is in the N.T. equally

conspicuous: so Mk. 10^{18}, Jno. 17^{3}, Rom. 16^{26}, 1 Cor. 8^{6}, 1 Tim. 2^{5}, Jas. 2^{19}, etc. On the other hand, we have seen that the N.T. writers agree in believing that with the one Ruler of earth and heaven is associated an eternal Companion, a Sharer of His infinite attributes and glory. How in their thought the ideas of the unity of God and the divinity of Christ were harmonized, we shall now consider.

99. The supreme UNITY of the Godhead resides conspicuously in the FATHER even as distinguished from the Son: so 1 Cor. 8^{6}. At the summit of every ascending scale, we have one Person, the Father, who usually bears as His sufficient designation the title *God*: so 1 Cor. 3^{23}, 11^{3}, 12^{6}, 15^{28}, Rom. 16^{27}, Ph. 2^{11}, 1 Tim. 1^{17}. So, conspicuously, Jno. 17^{3}. Throughout the N.T., the Father occupies, even as compared with the Son and Spirit, a position of unique supremacy. They are sent by Him; *e.g.* Gal. $4^{4,\ 6}$: we cannot conceive Him to be sent by Them.

The unity of the Godhead finds expression also in the SON, and in His unique relation to the Father and to the universe. All things are through Him, as the one Agent of creation and the one Head of the Church: 1 Cor. 8^{6}, Col. $1^{16,\ 18}$. Similarly, Jno. $5^{21,\ 22}$, 14^{6}; Mt. 11^{27}. Whatever the Father does, He does through the Son: and all who would come to the Father must come through the Son. Consequently, the homage paid to the Son is thereby paid to the Father.

In 1 Cor. 12^{4}, Mt. 28^{19}, we have a third element of the divine unity, viz. the one SPIRIT: see ch. 14.

This PLURALITY of divine persons is harmonized with the unity of God by the derivation of the Son and Spirit from the Father and their unreserved devotion to Him, this derivation and devotion being not merely historical or administrative, but eternal and essential. Each divine Person

is alone and supreme in His own sphere, and is thus a centre of unity to all created being: but within the Godhead, in relation to the Son and Spirit, as Their Source and Aim, the Father alone is absolutely Supreme.

100. The unity of the Father and Son is further asserted and illustrated in Jno. 10^{31}: "I and My Father are ONE." Christ evidently means that, in virtue of His relation to the Father, to snatch the sheep out of His hand is to snatch them out of the Father's hand; which He declares to be impossible. In other words, this unity involves participation in the infinite power of God.

Notice also Jno. $17^{11, 21-23}$: "that they may be one, AS WE ARE ONE." The human side of this comparison finds expression in ch. 11^{52}, "that the scattered children of God may be gathered into one." Let us conceive this purpose attained, as it will be attained in the glorified Church in heaven. Personal distinction will remain unimpaired. For spiritual growth has no tendency to destroy it, and personal distinction is needful for the manifestation and development of human excellence. The above comparison goes far to prove (§ 92) that between the Father and the Son there is personal distinction: for otherwise the comparison would be meaningless. The unity for which Christ prays is evidently that of perfect harmony, all loving the same objects and cherishing the same purposes, because all will love that which is most worthy of love and all will purpose only that which is good. So must we conceive the Son contemplating the entire thought of God, approving it because it is intrinsically good, making the Father's purposes to be His own, and devoting to their realisation without reserve His own infinite powers.

This unity differs from that which Christ desires for His followers in that, whereas the latter is acquired, the former

is ESSENTIAL and eternal. In virtue of their mode of existence and of the derivation of the Son and Spirit from the Father, the Persons of the Godhead can be no other than One: for the Stream cannot but be in harmony with its Source. But this difference does not mar the comparison. What God is essentially, Christ prays that His servants may BECOME, so far as the finite can become like the Infinite.

In Jno. 10^{30}, 17^{11}, $^{21\text{-}23}$, the only passages which assert that the Father and the Son are *One*, we have the NEUTER form ἕν; but in Gal. 3^{28}, for the unity of believers, we have the masculine: ὑμεῖς εἷς ἐστε ἐν Χριστῷ. There was here no danger of mistake: and Paul could appropriately use a masculine numeral to describe the living and intelligent unity of believers. But John guards against the error of supposing that the Father and the Son are together only one Person by using in each case the neuter form: "I and My Father are One thing."

101. It is now evident that in the thought of the writers of the N.T. there were not three Gods, but ONE GOD. Not to three divine Persons did they bow as each supreme, but to one, viz. the Father who is supreme and alone even in His relation to the Son and the Spirit. Nevertheless, beyond the infinite distance which separates the Creator from even the loftiest of His creatures, they saw three divine Persons, each alone in His own sphere and all united in closest essential harmony: the one Father, the one ultimate Source and Aim of whatever exists; one Lord, the one Agent of the entire activity of God and the one Head of the Church: and one Spirit, the inward animating principle of whatever lives.

102. We have now found complete historical proof that the various N.T. writers believed without a shadow of doubt

that Christ is INFINITELY GREATER and nearer to God than the greatest of men or angels. This result, we reached by a grammatical interpretation of documents which we traced by strictly historical methods, some to the pen of the most conspicuous of the apostles, and nearly all to Christian writers much within the first century after the death of Christ.

We found in the various N.T. documents widely different types of religious thought and expression. But this difference only threw into more conspicuous prominence the ONE definite and HARMONIOUS CONCEPTION underlying all these documents. Many details of our conception have been derived from one type of N.T. teaching, viz. the Johannine. But the whole conception is involved in, and is the only explanation of, abundant teaching which we have traced to the pen of Paul: and we have found the same conception underlying the Synoptic Gospels. This complete unanimity of writers so different in a matter so complex is one of the most conspicuous features of the New Testament.

The title *Son of God* is everywhere claimed by Christ, or is given to Him with profound reverence, as a title of unique dignity and as noting a unique relation to God. That this title involves a unique relation to God, is proved by the parable of the vineyard, by the term *only-begotten Son*, and by Paul's appeal to the love of Him who gave *His own Son* to save men. This unanimity compels us to believe that this august title, and in this sense, was actually claimed for Himself by Christ. He is also frequently spoken of as the future *Judge of the world*, and once as summoning to judgment all the dead. John and Paul speak of Him as earlier than the world, and say that by His agency all things were created. John goes still further by giving Him the title *God*, and representing Him as accepting it from one of His disciples.

Yet the N.T. writers agree to assert that there is only one God, whom they call *the Father*, reserving for Him even in distinction from the Son the title *God*. This reservation is explained by the subordination to the Father involved in Christ's ordinary title the *Son of God*, and frequently taught or implied by John and Paul. This title suggests, and express teaching of John asserts, the derivation of the Son from the Father.

103. This harmonious and clearly defined picture contains in the N.T. marks of DEVELOPMENT. In the Synoptic Gospels we find it in its most rudimentary form; in the letters of Paul, more fully developed: in the Fourth Gospel the development is complete. Even in the letters of Paul, *e.g.* between 1 Cor. 8^6 and Col. 1^{16f}, we can trace development. Similarly, to Nicodemus, Christ calls Himself "the only-begotten Son" of God: Thomas, after the resurrection, accosts Him as "my God."

This development, however, proceeds always on the same lines; the later teaching being always either a legitimate inference from the earlier or needful in order to give to it unity and intelligibility. Between the different N.T. writers, there is no contradiction: they differ only in their degree of definiteness and completeness. There is much more apparent contradiction between Mt. 19^{17} and 28^{19}, and between Jno. 1^1 and 14^{28} than between the First and Fourth Gospels taken as wholes.

The gradual DEVELOPMENT of the conception of the Son of God, as portrayed in the N.T., is easily EXPLAINED. In the Synoptic Gospels we have apparently a correct record of the ordinary public teaching of Christ, and in the Fourth Gospel a record of more private and occasional teaching. In one or both these forms, the teaching of Christ may have reached Paul: and in his thought, especially in the

quietness of prison life, the conception of the Son of God assumed the form we find in his letters. During His life, the teaching of Christ was very imperfectly comprehended by His disciples: but the exclamation of Thomas reveals the light which shone forth in their hearts from the face of their Risen Lord. In Jno. $1^{1\text{-}14}$, we have the mature thought about the dignity of Christ of one who heard and treasured and pondered His profoundest teaching about Himself.

Possibly the more fully developed N.T. teaching may, in its outer form, have been moulded by GENTILE MODES OF THOUGHT and expression. But the complete harmony of all N.T. writers about the Son of God, in absolute contrast to all other teaching, leaves no room for substantial contributions from sources outside Israel. Contemporary Greek and Oriental thought do little or nothing to elucidate the N.T. teaching about the Son of God.

104. This teaching involves a NEW and definite CONCEPTION OF GOD. Faint indications of a plurality of persons in the Godhead are found in the O.T.: but they are dim and uncertain. In Ps. 2^{7} we have a slight anticipation of a Son of God. But the definite and complex conception of Father, Son, and Spirit, which underlies the many-coloured pages of the N.T., is quite different from every conception of God set forth in the entire literature of the world except so far as later literature has been moulded by Christian teaching. As matter of simple historical fact, the N.T. embodies a complete revolution in man's thought about God.

105. All this demands explanation. Either the harmonious portrait of Christ in the N.T. is correct; or He made for Himself claims which are an infringement of the unique majesty of God; or His immediate disciples misunderstood

altogether His teaching about Himself and about His relation to God.

Now the grandeur of the moral teaching and of the example of Jesus forbids the thought that He put forth these august and unheard-of claims knowing them to be false. Scarcely less unlikely is the suggestion that Christ was Himself in serious error. For if, being only a man, He believed Himself to be divine, in the sense expounded above, He was a deluded fanatic. Easier far to believe that darkness can give forth light than that one labouring under so deep a delusion should become to all succeeding generations a bright morning star guiding and cheering the best of men safely amid the gloom of earth along a path which their own moral sense declares to be pure and lofty, Himself a constant incentive to them for all that is right and good. Impossible also is the suggestion that the apostles taught what they knew to be false. Their moral earnestness, as depicted in the N.T., proclaims them honest men.

Practically the ONLY ALTERNATIVE is either that in very truth Christ is infinitely greater than angels and men, or that all His immediate followers misunderstood His teaching about Himself and His relation to God, made for Him claims from which He would have recoiled with horror as blasphemy, and taught serious error touching the nature of God. Yet these men gained for Christ the homage of all succeeding ages, and through their activity He became the Saviour of the world.

Moreover, we must believe that all the early followers of Christ fell into the same COMPLICATED ERROR touching their Master. This is most unlikely. For error is always discordant. But, amid many outward differences, the N.T. writers held, as we have seen, one harmonious conception of Christ. If we reject this conception as incorrect, we must

believe that this complicated error took so firm hold of the early Christians that it survived unimpaired (see §§ 124–128) an age of controversies and has continued to our day as the deep conviction of an immense majority of the followers of Christ and as a powerful incentive to good in nearly all those who have done most to spread Christianity, and to help the spiritual life of men.

On the other hand, if the confident belief of the apostles and of the mass of Christians in all ages be correct, the facts of Christendom ARE EXPLAINED. If Christ be the Only-begotten Son of God, His birth was by far the greatest event in the history of the world, and Himself infinitely the Greatest of men. We wonder not that His advent was a new era in human history, and that the Gospel which proclaims His unique dignity is a power of God for salvation to all who believe.

The above argument will receive absolute confirmation in evidence which will prove (chs. 26–28) that Christ rose from the dead; and in (§ 312) the spiritual experience of those who put faith in Him. For it is inconceivable that the Conqueror of death would cherish, or tolerate in His most loyal followers, such error; or that it should be co-extensive with an experience so blessed.

CHAPTER XIII

THE INCARNATION OF THE SON

106. THE foregoing exposition and argument imply that at the BIRTH of Jesus the Eternal Son, Himself the Agent of man's creation, entered into a new and very intimate relation

to our race. We shall now consider the N.T. teaching about this stupendous event, and about the relation of the divine and human elements in the Incarnate Son.

107. In 2 Cor. 8^9, Paul writes, "ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that because of you He became poor, though He was rich, in order that ye by His poverty may become rich." The wealth laid down can be no other than that of the pre-existent Son: for we have no record or hint that Jesus was ever on earth rich in material good, or that He laid down such wealth in order to save men. Consequently, the word *became poor* conveys Paul's conception of the negative side of the act by which the Eternal Son entered human life. Now practically wealth is control over objects needful or pleasant to us. The worth of money is that it enables us to live in luxury, if we will; the poor man cannot gratify his inclinations or even supply his own needs. Paul's words imply that at His incarnation the Son laid aside, for a time and for our enrichment, His absolute control over all things; and submitted to creaturely and human limitations, and thus became conscious of human dependence and need.

Similarly in Ph. $2^{6,7}$, we read that the Son, although existing "in the form of God," did not look upon His equality with God as a means of self-enrichment, "but *emptied* Himself." See my *Commentary*. The words following, "made in the likeness of men," prove that Paul refers to the incarnation. We need not infer that the Son laid aside His equality with God or any element of His essential nature. For an empty vessel is as perfect in all its parts as a full one. To take away an essential part, is not to *empty*, but to mutilate. Nor does poverty involve change of character. These passages therefore suggest, not an essential change, but a change affecting all else except the essence of the Son.

Cp. Heb. 2^{17}: "it behoved Him to be made in all things

like His brethren." That He became like them in order to share their temptations and thus help the tempted, is suggested by *v.*[18]. Originally, in His possession of infinite power and enthroned above all ill, He seemed to be beyond reach of temptation, and therefore unlike us. He is here said to have put Himself within reach of it. So ch. 4[15]: "one who has been in all points *tempted* as we are, yet without sin."

In Jno. 1[14], we read that "the Word became flesh and pitched His tent in our midst . . . full of grace and truth." The words, "became flesh" (contrast 1 Jno. 4[2], "came in flesh") imply that the Son entered a mode of existence new to Him and *became* what He was not before; that He not only took upon Himself a bodily form, but accepted the limitations of human bodily life as the mode of His own existence on earth. This statement is, in spite of complete difference of form and thought, an exact counterpart and guard to Paul's assertions that He "emptied Himself" and "became poor."

108. With the above, we will now compare the picture of Christ given in the Gospels.

In Mt. 1[18, 25], Lk. 1[35], we read that Jesus was born, not by ordinary birth, but by an extraordinary putting forth of supernatural power. For this SUPERNATURAL BIRTH, we have not the abundant testimony which compelled us to believe that Christ claimed superhuman dignity, and which will in chs. 26, 27 prove His resurrection from the dead. But this last will remove all objection on the ground that supernatural birth involves a deviation from the ordinary course of nature. And that so stupendous an event as the entrance of the Son of God into human life should be accompanied by a special manifestation of superhuman power, is in the highest degree appropriate. We may therefore accept the above statements with reasonable confidence.

Profoundly interesting for the light it sheds on the condition of the God-Man is the charming story in Lk. 2^{41-52} about the BOY JESUS in the temple. He is fully conscious of His unique relation to God; and is surprised that Joseph and Mary did not know that He must needs be occupied with the affairs of His Father God. Yet He was making "progress in wisdom" as well as "in stature," and in "favour with God" as well as "with men." This implies a human intelligence capable of increasing knowledge; and permits us to believe that, although in the youthful Inquirer dwelt a divine Personality to whom the Father reveals whatever He does, His questions to the teachers in the temple were prompted by a sincere human desire for instruction.

From Lk. 3^{22}, $4^{1, 14}$, we infer that during His life on earth the Son acted under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, and that at His baptism He received from the SPIRIT a power not previously possessed by Him. Similarly, from Mt. 12^{28} we learn that His miracles were wrought in the power, not of Himself as divine, but of the Spirit of God; as were (Acts 1^{8}) those of His disciples. This suggests that during His life on earth the omnipotence of the Son lay dormant; and that thus He "emptied Himself" and "became poor." Similarly, in Mt. 26^{53}, self-defence by His own divine power is left out of sight and the only help suggested is that of "angels;" manifestly because the exercise of His own power had for a time been laid aside.

Even at the close of His career, Christ asserts (Mk. 13^{32} and probably Mt. 24^{36}) that He does NOT KNOW the day of His return. This implies that, in some way to us inconceivable because divine, the Son of God at His incarnation had laid aside for a time and for our salvation the full exercise of His divine intelligence, and had accepted a human mind as the channel of His own knowledge, in order that

thus He might know by experience human ignorance and expose Himself to the temptations involved therein. On the other hand, see Jno. 2^{25}, 21^{17}. Such blending of divine omniscience with the limitations of human knowledge is what we might expect in the Eternal Word who had become flesh. In Jno. 11^{33}, 12^{27}, 13^{21}, we find human emotion and even sorrow.

109. The above scattered notices reveal to us, in a human body with bodily powers and functions, also HUMAN INTELLIGENCE and emotions. But the whole picture presents only one Person; not a mixture of God and man, but a divine Person living a pure and full human life, capable of suffering yet remembering the glory (Jno. 17^{5}) which He had with the Father before the world was.

This picture sheds light on the wealth and the fulness which Paul asserts that the Son laid aside. We have seen that these assertions do not imply that He permitted to become dormant even for a moment the infinite love which is the essence of God. Moreover, in love are implied all moral attributes: to be untruthful or unjust, is to be unloving. Consequently, the teaching before us does not imply the laying aside, even for a moment, of any moral attribute. And such denial of Himself is impossible and inconceivable: 2 Tim. 2^{13}.

But the natural attributes of God are NOT always in FULL EXERCISE; and do not prompt or control every action of God, as do the moral attributes just mentioned. To forbear to put forth His infinite power, is therefore not inconsistent with the nature of God. We may, consequently, conceive the Son laying aside for a time and for man's good the full exercise of His divine power and accepting as the measure of His activity the capacities of human nature; and, where these were insufficient for His great mission, receiving

extraordinary strength from the Spirit of God. So may we explain His growth in knowledge and His ignorance of the day of His return, by supposing that at His entrance into human life the Eye Omniscient, while preserving unimpaired its capacity for infinite perception, was for a time closed, permitting the Incarnate Son to receive knowledge through the avenue of a human mind taught by the Spirit of God. In other words, we may believe that, while retaining in full exercise those moral attributes which are the essence of God, He allowed His divine power and knowledge to be for a time dormant, in order that under the conditions of human life on earth He might reveal God to man and work out deliverance for man. If so, as compared with His pre-existent glory and fulness, His life on earth was poverty and emptiness: and Paul's words imply that these were accepted by a definite act of the Son at His entrance into human life.

110. The above teaching confirms and supplements that of chs. 11 and 12. For it implies the PRE-EXISTENT wealth and fulness of Christ. Now this Wealthy One cannot be the Father. For we have no hint, nor can we conceive, that He emptied Himself and became poor. Consequently, the self-emptying reveals a pre-existent Person other than the Father. And the various pictures of the incarnate Son in the N.T. agree to represent Him as possessing an intelligence subject to human limitations and a heart capable of human sorrow. In other words, we find there a created and finite, but perfect and pure, human spirit accepted by the Eternal Son as the condition of His life on earth.

Attempts to set forth the action of the Son upon Himself at His entrance into human life are frequently called KENOTIC THEORIES; from Paul's words ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν in Ph. 2^7, describing the same action. They are an attempt to comprehend, so far as God will reveal it to us, the manner and

measure in which the infinite personality of the Son of God entered the limitations of human life. Such theories must hold fast the unchangeable divinity of Christ, and the reality of His manhood.

CHAPTER XIV

THE SPIRIT OF GOD

111. WITH "the Father and the Son" are associated in Mt. 28^{19} "the Holy Spirit." This mysterious THIRD of the divine Three demands now our best attention.

In Gen. 2^{2}, above the chaos of an unformed world hovers "the Spirit of God," the Source and animating Principle of the order and life which are to be. In Ex. 31^{3}, 35^{31}, the same Spirit is said to have been given to Bezaleel and others, to enable them with divine wisdom to erect the tabernacle in the wilderness as a suitable temporary abode of the God of Israel. In Jud. 13^{25}, 14^{6}, etc., the Spirit of Jehovah gave to Sampson superhuman muscular strength. In later days, "the sweet psalmist of Israel said, The Spirit of Jehovah spoke in me, and His word was on my tongue:" 2 Sam. $23^{1,2}$. In Ezek. 2^{2}, a Spirit enters into the prophet, sets him upon his feet, and through him speaks to men. These passages, and many others similar, evidently describe a divine inspiration by which men became the hand, the arm, and the intelligent voice of God.

In Jud. 9^{23}, 1 Sam. 16^{14}, we have an "evil spirit from Jehovah;" in *vv.*^{15,16}, "an evil spirit of God." And in 1 Kgs. $22^{21\text{-}23}$ "the Spirit" becomes "a spirit of falsehood"

in the mouths of false prophets. So Isa. 29^{10}: "a spirit of deep sleep." In all these cases, the Spirit of God inflicts punishment by blinding or disturbing the minds of men.

In Ps. 51^{11}, Isa. 63^{10}, we read of the "Spirit of Thy holiness:" in the LXX. "Thy Holy Spirit," an anticipation of a frequent N.T. use.

112. The word rendered SPIRIT in the above passages is in Gen. 6^{17}, 7^{15} rendered *breath*, but in *v.*^{22} (R.V.) *spirit*: cp. 2 Sam. 22^{16}, Job. 4^{9}, etc., Ps. 33^{6}, etc. It is rendered *wind* in Gen. 8^{1}, Ex. $10^{13,\ 19}$, and frequently: cp. Isa. 40^{7}. In Gen. 45^{27}, Ex. 6^{9}, Num. 14^{24}, 1 Sam. 1^{15}, Eccl. 12^{7}, etc., it is rendered *spirit*; and denotes evidently the principle of life, the seat of the emotions, thoughts, etc. Cp. Eccl. $3^{19,\ 21}$, R.V. marg. The above three renderings are found in Ezek. $37^{1,\ 5,\ 6,\ 8,\ 9,\ 10,\ 14}$; the combination revealing the ideas conveyed by the Hebrew word: see R.V. marg. Cp. Jno. 3^{8}, R.V. marg.

113. The usual GREEK equivalent (πνεῦμα) of this word, always used in the phrase *Spirit of God*, etc., denotes in Mt. 27^{50}, Lk. 8^{55}, 23^{46}, Jas. 2^{26}, Rev. 11^{11}, 13^{15} the unseen principle of life, in contrast to the body. And, since life is a condition of intelligence, power, and activity, the word *spirit* denotes the seat of knowledge, emotion, purpose, and the source of action: 1 Cor. 2^{11}, Mk. 2^{8}; Lk. 1^{47}, Acts 17^{16}; 19^{21}; Rom. 1^{9}. The *spirit* is the unseen and immaterial and animating principle which gives, to the visible and material flesh animated by it, life, intelligence, power, and activity.

114. In Joel $2^{28,\ 29}$, we read that in days to come God will pour out His Spirit on ALL sorts of MEN and WOMEN. The fulfilment of this prophecy is announced in Acts 2^{16}: and the gift of the Holy Spirit to dwell in the servants of Christ is conspicuous in the N.T., from Mt. 3^{11} onwards. Throughout the Bible the Spirit of God, and in N.T. the

Holy Spirit, is the Bearer, in the heart of man, of the presence and knowledge and power and activity of God. Wherever the Spirit is, there is God putting forth divine powers in the heart of man, and making him to be an organ of the self-manifestation of God to other men.

In 1 Cor. 2^{11}, the Spirit of God is compared to man's own spirit. This comparison implies that the Spirit of God bears to our spirit a relation in some respects ANALOGOUS to that of God to man. This analogy, carefully used, will illustrate the term before us. Just as the *spirit* (Lk. 8^{55}) given back to Jairus' daughter restored to her lifeless form life, consciousness, activity, and development, so the Spirit of God breathed into those who put faith in Christ gives to them a deathless life, makes them conscious of the eternal realities, imparts a new spiritual power and activity, and puts into their lips a new song of praise. And, just as our spirit is altogether different from, and in essential dignity greater than, our body, yet united to it by an all-pervading and mysterious fellowship, so the Spirit of God is in essential dignity infinitely greater than our spirit, yet pervading it by a still more mysterious fellowship.

The Spirit of God always acts upon us from the INMOST chamber of our being, *i.e.* with full consent of whatever in us is noblest and blest; in marked contrast to sin, which never secures our highest approbation, and thus betrays its foreign and inferior and hostile origin.

115. In the above passages and many others similar, the term *Spirit of God* suggests little more than the inward presence of God, who is Himself (Jno. 4^{24}) essentially *spirit*, acting directly on man's own spirit, and imparting to him a higher life, intelligence, activity, and power. But other teaching now claims attention.

In Jno. $14^{16.\ 26}$, 15^{26}, 16^{7}, the Holy Spirit is called THE

PARACLETE: see R.V. marg. This Gk. word denotes etymologically one called to our side, especially as a HELPER; and is occasionally used in classical Greek and by Philo, nearly always in the sense of one who pleads before a judge, like the Latin *advocatus*. So 1 Jno. 2^1, the only other place in the N.T. in which it occurs. But this meaning is not suggested in the above passages. We must therefore fall back on the more general sense of *helper*, one called to our side to assist us in any need: cp. Philo, *Creation of the World* § 6. In Rom. 8^{24} the Spirit helps us by pleading for us. He does this by prompting and guiding our own prayers.

The title SPIRIT OF THE TRUTH suggests that He is the animating and life-giving principle of the realities revealed by God to man, using the Gospel as His instrument, and giving to it life and power: cp. Eph. 6^{17}. In Jno. 14^{18}, Christ speaks of the coming of the Paraclete as His own return to His disciples: cp. Gal. 2^{20}, Eph. 3^{17}. For, as Bearer of the presence of God, where the Spirit is, Christ is.

In Jno. $14^{16, 26}$, Christ, Himself about to leave His disciples, announces that the Father will send to them ANOTHER HELPER. Now in § 92 we saw that in Christ, as His followers believed, dwelt in human form a divine Person distinct from the Father. This suggests strongly that also the "other Helper" is likewise a PERSON (see § 120) distinct from the Father. Moreover in Jno. 16^{13f} we notice, in conspicuous apposition to the neuter form τὸ Πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, the masculine pronoun ἐκεῖνος, repeated in *v.*^{14} without any masculine term requiring it. Again, in *v.*^{13} we read, "He will not speak from Himself, but so many things as He hears He will speak." This implies, in the Spirit, a Person distinct from Him to whose voice He listens. For, without two Persons there can be no listening of one to the other. And, that the Spirit speaks only what He hears, implies

subordination to Him whose words He re-echoes. All this implies a third Person distinct from the Father and the Son: and, that His presence will be better for the disciples (ch. 16^{7}) than the bodily presence of Christ, implies clearly that this distinct Person is also divine.

This inference receives remarkable confirmation in Mt. 28^{19}, where the Risen One associates a THIRD NAME with those of the Father and the Son. It is further confirmed in Rom. 8^{26}, where the Spirit "intercedes on behalf of saints." For intercession can be real only between two or more persons. In 1 Cor. 12^{4-6}, we have, in inverse order, the same *Spirit*, the same *Lord*, and the same *God*. Cp. also 2 Cor. 13^{13}, Rev. 1^{4-6}.

The only explanation of these passages is that in the Godhead are, as Persons distinct from the Father, an eternal Son and an eternal Spirit.

116. That both Son and Spirit are SUBORDINATE to the Father, is implied in Their being sent by Him, the One historically into the world, the Other into the hearts of men: so, very clearly, Gal. $4^{4, 6}$; cp. Rev. 5^{6}. The Spirit is sent by both the Father and the Son: Jno 14^{26}, 15^{26}. And He is called indifferently the Spirit of God and of Christ: Rom. 8^{9}, etc. This suggests that the Son and Spirit hold a similar relation to the Father. The precise nature of this relation is veiled in mystery. But the analogy of the Son suggests irresistibly that the nature of the Spirit, like that of the Son, is an outflow of the nature of the Father. We notice however that the title *Son* and the filial relation involved therein are strictly reserved for "the Only-begotten Son." This implies that the mode of the Spirit's derivation from the Father differs in kind from that of the Son. But in what the difference consists, we cannot comprehend.

The only passage bearing on this subject is Jno. 15^{26},

"who GOES FORTH from the presence of the Father." This may refer either to the ESSENTIAL DERIVATION of the Spirit from the Father or to the HISTORIC going forth of the Spirit just promised. In the one case, this promise is placed in relation to an abiding habit of the Spirit; in the other case, to His essential relation to the Father. But, since we cannot doubt that the whole activity of the Spirit is an outflow of His essence, this uncertainty does not lessen the value of this passage as illustrating the relation of the Spirit to the Father. We may therefore infer that, like the Son, the Spirit also is an eternal Stream from the eternal Fountain, a Stream going forth, in virtue of His mode of existence, from God into the hearts of men.

This going forth from the Father is often called the "PROCESSION OF THE SPIRIT." See also § 126.

117. The somewhat scanty, yet decisive, evidence in § 115 leaves the personality of the Spirit much less conspicuous in the N.T. than is that of the Father and the Son. It is obscured by the NEUTER form of the Greek word for *Spirit*, which except in Jno. 16^{13f} is constructed with neuter pronouns. But this neuter form is quite consistent with personality: cp. Lk. 1^{35}; and Mk. $5^{23, 39, 40, 41}$, where however the pronouns are feminine.

Perhaps in this comparative CONCEALMENT of the personality of the Spirit there is religious significance. He ever hides Himself, in order that every eye may be fixed upon the Son. In this self-effacement, the Spirit now becomes our Pattern and Companion. So far as we are led by Him, we also shall hide ourselves behind the glory of the Son of God. If the Spirit were but an impersonal influence going forth from God to lead men to bow to Him, there would be no moral worth in this self-abnegation. It would be, in a sense, only mechanical. But when we know that the Spirit is

Himself a Person, distinct from the Father and the Son as we are, yet infinitely greater than all human personality, His action becomes our pattern; and He becomes not only our Guide but our divine Companion. This example of self-effacement, the Son cannot set. For His work requires that He attract every eye to Himself as the object of their worship and trust and love. Thus in the Godhead, in the love and beneficence of the Father, in the obedience and self-sacrifice and devotion of the Son, and in the unobtrusive activity of the Spirit, we have a perfect pattern of all human excellence.

118. The word SPIRIT is often used (*e.g.* Gal. 5^{16}, 6^{8}, Rom. 8^{26}) as a DISTINCTIVE TITLE of the Third divine Person even as compared with the Father and the Son, who are also essentially Spirit. It is specially appropriate to Him who comes into actual contact with our spirit as the immediate inward Source of our higher life, and the moving principle of our thoughts, words, acts. He is also HOLY: see § 269. For God is the one aim of the influence He constantly exerts. Every moment He comes forth from the Father in order to lead us back to Him. All realised human holiness is the mind of the Spirit of God breathed into those to whom He is the soul of their soul and the life of their life. Hence the frequent term HOLY SPIRIT.

CHAPTER XV

THE ETERNAL THREE IN ONE. THE NICENE CREED

119. IN chs. 1 and 2 we found, in the material universe around us and in our own moral sense, clear indications of an intelligent Creator and righteous Ruler of the world,

indications reflected more or less clearly in all ancient literature. The same teaching is found still more clearly in the O.T.: and in ch. 21 we shall find it conspicuously reasserted and developed by Christ, who spoke ever about a loving Father in heaven.

We have now found abundant evidence that, while accepting and enforcing the strict monotheism of His nation, Jesus gave to it a modification unheard of till His day, except in faintest outline in the Old Testament. By claiming for Himself a unique relation to God involving His own pre-existence with God in eternity and a participation in the infinity of God, and by speaking of the Spirit in words suggesting or implying a personality distinct from the Father, Christ gave to men a NEW CONCEPTION OF GOD, viz. as consisting of Three Persons, of whom the Second and Third share with the First by derivation from Him, in modes peculiar to each, His eternal and infinite nature. We learnt also that the entire life of the Son is not only derived from, but devoted to, the Father, an infinite and eternal Stream flowing back in full volume to its Source. A similar derivation and devotion, analogy compels us to attribute to the Spirit. And in this essential subordination of the Son and Spirit to the Father, lies the essential unity of the Godhead. That we owe to Christ this somewhat complicated conception, held fast, as we shall see, by nearly all His followers in all ages, is an assured result of our theological research.

120. The terms PERSON and PERSONAL, as commonly understood, and as used in this volume, suggest intelligence and moral character, this last involving self-determination and all that distinguishes men from animals: § 138. To speak of Three Persons in the Godhead, is to assert a distinction between Them analogous to, though infinitely higher than, that which distinguishes man from man. This analogy is

implied in Jno. $17^{11, 22}$: "that they may be one, as We are One. But all use of human relationships to describe the nature of God, even those so used in the N.T., is liable, owing to the infinite difference between God and man, to serious misunderstanding. Yet we can know God and have intelligent intercourse with Him only by the analogy of those elements in man which are akin to God. We therefore need not hesitate to accept the historical phraseology of the Church and to speak of ONE GOD in THREE PERSONS, and of the divine and human natures in the ONE PERSON of the God-Man.

121. In Rom. $5^{8, 10}$, 8^{32}, Jno. 3^{16}, 1 Jno. $4^{9, 10}$, etc., the proof of the love of God is traced to an essential relation of Christ to God. This eternal relation within the Godhead reveals the infinite cost of man's salvation, and the greatness of the love which prompted a redemption so costly. Thus the doctrine of the TRINITY, implied in claims proved to have been made by Christ, affords a proof of the love of God impossible in a unipersonal GOD. This is its chief practical significance.

It may be OBJECTED that the above argument implies that man's sin was needful for his full development; on the ground that otherwise the death of Christ would have been needless, and therefore the wonderful manifestation of the love of God therein given would not have been made; or in other words that we owe to man's sin this surpassing manifestation of God. Possibly for a full manifestation of God, it was needful that a divine Person should assume human form, in order that human life and thought might be permeated with life divine. Had not man sinned, this would have brought to the Incarnate One neither death nor suffering. How, in this case, God could have given an equal proof of His love, passes our thought.

But that He could have revealed Himself to man, apart from man's sin, we cannot doubt. In any case, the actual and historic revelation of God in Christ would have been impossible had there been no Divine Person other than the Father. For without distinction of Persons there could be no love of the Father for the Son.

122. The EXAMPLE of Christ (§ 294) receives its chief value from His relation to God. Even as a man, He claims our profound respect. But when we know that He who walked humbly along a path marked out for Him by God from the manger to the cross, never for a moment roused to resentment by the persistent malice of His enemies, but speaking only to comfort and bless, is Himself the Creator and Judge even of His enemies, our respect is raised to loftiest adoration. In the presence of such grandeur, veiled in guise so lowly, whatever in us is best, bows in silent awe. Henceforth any sacrifice by man sinks into insignificance beside the stupendous self-devotion of the eternal Son. This supreme example, we owe to the teaching of Christ and His apostles about the dignity of the Son of God, this involving One God in Three Persons.

123. In ch. 34 we shall find that this manifestation of God in Christ and this supreme example of Christ are brought to bear on us by the Holy Spirit, who opens our hearts to understand the significance of His life, death, and resurrection. Thus in the spiritual life of men are active all Three Persons of the Godhead. From the FATHER spring, as their ultimate Source, the universe and man and all good: and the Kingdom of God, built up out of saved humanity, is an accomplishment of His purpose. Whatever God has done outwardly and visibly, within historic times or before history began, He did through the agency of the SON, the divine Person whose special function it is to give

to the thought of God utterance and outward realisation. Whatever God does in the heart of Man, He does through the Holy SPIRIT, who opens our eyes to see and understand the work of the Son. So 1 Cor. 8^6, 12^3.

Through the Son and the Spirit, God created the world, and now comes near and reveals Himself to men. Thus within the Godhead are AVENUES of God's SELF-MANIFESTATION to man and of man's approach to God. But between a unipersonal God and His creatures there would be an infinite gulf across which they could scarcely hear His voice or see His face. He would be little more than a distant abstraction; less to us than to the O.T. Psalmists. For Israel's intercourse with God was strengthened by hopes of a fuller revelation. But, to thousands of busy men and women, the vision of the Eternal Son incarnate for their salvation, and the felt inward presence of a divine Helper, distinct from the Father into whose presence He leads them and from the Son whom He reveals to them, afford an intercourse with God otherwise impossible and inconceivable. And to them, the Father, Son, and Spirit, each reigning alone in His own sphere yet in perfect harmony, the function of each supplementing that of the Others, are one God.

124. The remarkable unanimity with which the N.T. writers ascribe to Christ a unique dignity involving a new and complex conception of God finds a wonderful counterpart in the AGREEMENT of nearly ALL CHRISTIANS of all ages and Churches in holding fast the N.T. teaching about Christ and His relation to God.

The FIRST ECUMENICAL (or World-wide) COUNCIL, at NICÆA in A.D. 325, as against Arius who denied (Socrates, *Church History* bk. i. 5) the eternal pre-existence of Christ, put forth (*Ibid.* § 8) the following Creed:

"We believe in one God, the Father almighty, maker of all things both visible and invisible; and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God begotten from the Father, only-begotten, *i.e.* from the essence (οὐσίας) of the Father, God from God (Θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ), light from light, true God from true God, begotten not made, of the same essence (ὁμοούσιον) with the Father, through whom all things were made, both those in the heaven and those in the earth, who because of us men and because of our salvation came down and was made flesh, became man, suffered, and rose on the third day, went up into the heavens, and comes again to judge men living and dead; and in the Holy Spirit. But those who say there was a time when He was not, or that He was not before He was begotten, and that out of nothing He began to be, or say that the Son of God is from a different (ὑποστάσεως ἢ οὐσίας) substance or essence, or is mutable or capable of change, these the Catholic and Apostolic Church anathematizes."

Notice here, as in N.T., the title "Son of God" as unique honour; also "only-begotten" as in Jno. 3^{16}, etc. The phrases "God from God," etc., express accurately and beautifully the Son's derivation from the Father. The words "begotten not made" distinguish between His unique derivation from the Father and that of men and angels. The word rendered *of-the-same-essence*, about which there was much contention, suitably describes the Son as sharing with the Father all that the latter has and is. With "through whom all things were made," cp. Jno. 1^{3}, Col. 1^{16}: with "was made flesh," cp. Jno. 1^{14}. This creed is complete proof that the belief of the N.T. writers was held by the Fathers at Nicæa.

125. In spite of this decision, controversy raged for many years; until the SECOND ECUMENICAL COUNCIL at CON-

STANTINOPLE in A.D. 381 gave to it a final victory. From that time, the Nicene Creed enlarged, with omission of the anathema and a few redundant or unimportant phrases, and brought into a form nearly the same as that in the Anglican Prayer Book, has been accepted in all ages and Churches as a correct exposition of the dignity of Christ. It is embodied in "the Orthodox Confession of the Eastern Church" adopted by the Græco-Russian Synod at Jassy in A.D. 1643; and in the first doctrinal decree of the Council of Trent, as the universal profession of the Roman Church. It is accepted in the first article of the Augsburg Confession, which embodies the faith of the German Reformers; and the same teaching underlies all the Confessions of the Reformed Churches of the Continent. The amended Nicene Creed is recited in the Anglican Communion Service: and the same teaching finds expression in "the Westminster Confession of Faith," which embodies the belief of all Presbyterian Churches; and is held firmly by the Congregational, Baptist, and Methodist Churches. In short, except the Unitarians, always a very small minority of the Christian community, the conception of the Father, Son, and Spirit, as set forth in the N.T. and expounded above, has dominated the entire thought and life of Christendom, especially of those who have done most to raise the fallen, to build up the Church, and to carry the Gospel to the heathen.

126. The origin of the amendment of the Creed of Nicæa is open to doubt. The Council of Constantinople, in its first Canon, confirmed "the faith of the 318 fathers who came together at Nicæa." So did the FOURTH ECUMENICAL COUNCIL at CHALCEDON in A.D. 451. The *Definition of the Faith* there put forth decrees that men "hold fast also the matters defined by the 150 holy

fathers at Constantinople for removal of the heresies then rife and for confirmation of the same Catholic and Apostolic faith;" and quotes as follows "The Symbol of the 150. We believe in one God, the Father almighty, maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible: And in one Lord, Jesus Christ, the Only-begotten Son of God, begotten from the Father before all the ages; light from light, true God from true God; begotten, not made, of the same essence with the Father; through whom all things were made; who because of us men and because of our salvation came down from the heavens, and was made flesh from the Holy Spirit and Mary the virgin, and became man; was crucified also on our behalf under Pontius Pilate, and suffered, and was buried, and rose on the third day according to the Scriptures; and went up into the heavens, and sits at the right hand of the Father, and comes again with glory to judge men living and dead; of whose kingdom there will be no end: And in the Holy Spirit, the Lord and the life-giver, who goes forth from the Father; who with Father and Son is together worshipped and together glorified, who spoke through the prophets: In one holy Catholic and Apostolic Church. We acknowledge one baptism for pardon of sins: we look for a resurrection of the dead, and a life of the age to come. Amen."

There is other evidence to show that this revised Creed existed earlier than the Council at Constantinople. It may have been read there; and indeed accepted. This is perhaps the easiest explanation of the reference to it in the Definition of Chalcedon. But it is not mentioned in the account of the council given by Socrates. Whatever be its origin, it has superseded the symbol drawn up at Nicæa, as the creed of the universal Church in all later ages; and has inherited the name of the displaced creed.

The addition to the Revised Creed of the words *and the Son* (*et Filio* or *Filioque*), now universal in the West, is also obscure. The earliest sure trace of it is in Spain, at the Council of Toledo in A.D. 589. The earlier form simply quotes Jno. 15^{26}: the later one adds to it a not unfair theological inference. With this addition, the revised creed is recited in the Anglican and some other Churches. See § 116.

127. The Second Ecumenical Council condemned the teaching of *Apollinaris*, who taught that, in the Incarnate Son, the divine nature of the Son of God took the place of a reasoning soul, admitting in the humanity of Christ only a body and an unreasoning soul. The Third Ecumenical Council, at Ephesus in A.D. 431, condemned *Nestorius*, Patriarch of Constantinople, who taught that in the Incarnate Son were two distinct Persons. The Council of Chalcedon (see above) condemned the teaching of *Eutyches* that the Son had only one nature, a sort of combination of the divine and human. At this council was read a letter written two years earlier by Leo, Bishop of Rome to Flavian, then Patriarch of Constantinople, but since dead. Its teaching was accepted by the council and embodied in a Definition of the Faith (see above) as follows:

"Following then the holy fathers, we acknowledge one and the same Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, and all agree to teach that the same is perfect in Godhead, the same perfect in Manhood, truly God and truly Man, that the same consists of a reasoning soul and body, of the same essence with the Father according to the Godhead, and that He is of the same essence with us according to the Manhood, in all things like us apart from sin; begotten before the ages from the Father according to the Godhead, and that in the last days because of us men and because of our salvation the same

was begotten of Mary the virgin, the God-mother, according to His Manhood; one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, Only-begotten, made known in two natures, without confusion, without change, without division, without separation; the difference of the natures in no-wise removed because of the union, but rather the peculiarity of the natures preserved, and being combined into One Person and One Substance, not as parted or divided into two persons, but in order that the two may become the same Son and Only-begotten, God the Word, the Lord Jesus Christ; according as, concerning Him, from the beginning the prophets and the Lord Jesus Christ Himself instructed us, and the formula of the fathers has handed down to us."

That there was in the Incarnate Son a created human intelligence, is attested by (see § 108) His limited knowledge. And all that He says about Himself implies that in Him was only One Person, viz. the Eternal Son who had mysteriously assumed the limitations of human nature. The title *God-mother*, inappropriate and offensive as it seems to us, was designed to contradict the teaching of Nestorius, by asserting that Mary's Son is divine. The whole definition is a correct, if somewhat clumsy, reproduction of N.T. teaching about the relation of the divine and human in the Incarnate Son of God.

128. The almost unanimous agreement of Christians touching the nature of Christ, amid much disagreement on minor topics, is one of the most wonderful features of Christianity: and it has already been traced to the harmonious teaching of the various N.T. writers. No fact in the history of human thought is better attested than that the doctrine of the Son of God, as expounded above in chs. 11–13, was the actual teaching of the Author of the great religious impulse which has changed the whole course of human

thought and life from ruin to sustained progress. The justice of the stupendous claims involved in this teaching will receive, in chs. 26–28, decisive confirmation in historical evidence that He was raised from the dead.

CHAPTER XVI

ANGELS GOOD AND BAD

129. THE immense interval between man and God, human thought has ever peopled with beings greater than man yet less than God. This deeply rooted and often distorted conception, both O.T. and N.T. accept and purify.

The word rendered ANGEL in Gen. $16^{7\text{-}11}$, etc., denotes in 1 Sam. $19^{11\text{-}21}$, etc., persons sent with a message or to do special work. In the LXX., it is almost always rendered by the original of our word *angel*, which denotes in classical Greek one who brings a message or news, but in N.T. bears the full significance of the Hebrew word. Its meaning may be studied in Mt. 11^{10}, Mk. 1^{2}, Lk. 7^{27}; 7^{24}, 9^{52}. Elsewhere in N.T., and often in O.T., it denotes superhuman messengers sent by God to do His work on earth.

In Gen. $16^{7\text{-}11}$, 2 Sam. $24^{16,\ 17}$, etc., Mt. $1^{20,\ 24}$, $2^{13,\ 19}$, 28^{2}, Acts 5^{19}, 8^{26}, etc., the term ANGEL OF JEHOVAH, OF GOD, OF THE LORD denotes a superhuman person sent by God to man. That sometimes he was not at first recognised as such, implies that he appeared in ordinary human form. In Gen. 18^{3} Abraham saw three men, and, addressing one of them in the singular, invites them to take refreshment. In *v.*^{20f}, Jehovah says that He will go down and see whether

the sin of Sodom is as great as He has heard. "The men" then went towards Sodom, but Abraham remained standing "before Jehovah." In ch. 19^{1}, two angels arrive in Sodom; suggesting that one remained with Abraham and listened to his pleading for Sodom. In *vv.*$^{19\text{-}22}$, Lot addresses one of the two angels in the singular, either as superior or as specially commissioned to himself.

It has been suggested that the "angel of Jehovah" either always or sometimes was the uncreated Son of God, this explaining the divine authority with which he sometimes speaks: and this has been appealed to as proof of the existence of a divine Person other than the Father. But this argument is weakened by the fact that both Abraham and Lot pay special deference to one angel, but evidently not to the same angel. It is further weakened by the silence of N.T. about this identification; and by the frequent N.T. use of the term in places where it can only refer to a created angel. It is disproved by Paul's teaching in Gal. 3^{19} that the Law was "ordained through angels;" and by the argument in Heb. 2^{2}, which implies that the angels who gave the Law are inferior to Christ.

In O.T. and N.T., the word *angels* often denotes superhuman messengers through whom God spoke to men and worked out His purposes among them. That they sometimes bore apparently human form, was an anticipation of the fuller manifestation of God given by the Son of God in human flesh and blood.

130. In Gen. 3^{24}, CHERUBS guard with sword of flame the tree of life. In Ezek. $1^{5\text{-}25}$, we see four living creatures, each with four faces and four wings: and in ch. $10^{1\text{-}22}$ they are called *cherubs*. We find them again in Rev. $4^{6\text{-}8}$, around the throne, their cry recalling Isa. 6^{3}. We have here apparently another order of heavenly beings, not sent to earth on errands

of mercy or anger, but abiding before the throne of God in heaven or guarding His presence on earth.

In Dan. 7^{16}, 10^{18}; $8^{13\text{-}26}$, 9^{21}, superhuman teachers instruct Daniel. Similarly, in Rev. 9^{9f}, 22^{8f}, an angel, who refuses worship as being only a fellow-servant, shows to John coming events.

In Dan. $10^{13, 20, 21}$, we find PRINCES, evidently superhuman, and apparently in charge of Israel, Persia, and Greece: cp. Mt. 18^{10}. In Dan. 12^{1}, one of them, *Michael*, is mentioned in special relation to the general resurrection: cp. 1 Th. 4^{16}; also Jude ^{9}, Rev. 12^{7}. The term *prince*, in LXX. ἄρχων, reappears in the first syllable of *arch*angel. A cognate word is found in Rom. 8^{38}, Eph. 1^{21}, Col. 1^{16}: cp. 1 Pet. 3^{22}. These words evidently describe a distinction of rank among the superhuman servants of God. In Mt. 13^{41}, we hear Christ giving commands to angels, as His servants: from Heb. 1^{4}, Col. 1^{16f} we learn that He is greater than they, and that in, through, and for Him they were created.

In Job. 1^{6}, the SONS OF GOD are evidently superhuman.

In these transitory glimpses, we see intelligent creatures far above human weakness and sin, earlier than our race, created through and for the Son of God, their Lord and ours, obeying and worshipping Him, yet ministering to the needs of us their fellow-servants on earth. That they bow to our Lord, reveals the infinite greatness of Him whom they and we serve.

131. In 1 Chr. 21^{1}, Job 1^{6}, Zech. 3^{1}, we find an *adversary* or SATAN, evidently supernatural: same Hebrew word in N.T. frequently. The same great enemy is called the DEVIL, a Greek word denoting (*e.g.* 2 Tim. 3^{3}, Tit. 2^{3})

accuser or *slanderer*. Other titles are found in Mt. $13^{19, 38}$, Eph. 6^{16}, 1 John 2^{13f}, 5^{18f}, etc.; Jno. 12^{31}, 16^{11}; 2 Cor. 4^{4}. In Lk. 8^{12}, 22^{3}, etc., this awful personality is a source of immediate inward spiritual influences leading men away from God. Cp. Job 2^{7}, Lk. 13^{16}.

With this great enemy are associated others, subordinate allies in his evil work: *e.g.* Mt. 25^{41}, Rev. 12^{7}; Mt. 9^{34}, 12^{24}, "the prince of the DEMONS." This last word is in N.T. their common title. In Eph. 2^{2} we have a spiritual influence subordinate to the prince of evil: cp. ch. 6^{11f}, which suggests various ranks of superhuman foes analogous to the successive ranks of good angels.

132. All this and much else implies that behind and beneath the various evil influences around us are unseen personal opponents using these influences to work out their deadly purposes; also, directing their activity and giving to it a hostile unity, one mysterious foe, the changeless antagonist of all good. This realm of evil, acting under its chief, is an awful counterpart to the realm of good controlled by God and working out His purposes. That evil in man stands related to unseen persons and a person mightier than man, is congruous with its superhuman power and with the abnormal unity underlying its infinite diversity. It gives to the Christian life the tremendous reality of a personal struggle against superhuman antagonists: so Eph. 6^{11-17}.

Since whatever exists has been created by God, we infer with certainty that even Satan and his angels are His creatures. If so, they have fallen: and this suggests a probation in which they failed. So Jude ^{6}: and, for their punishment, Mt. 25^{41}. This suggests further that in a like probation the holy angels have been victorious. We may therefore look upon them as having themselves experienced

the fierceness of conflict; and now as victors helping us who are still in the heat of battle; and upon those who have failed as using their powers to destroy others. If so, the moral conflict raging all around us is part of a conflict wider than the millions of our race.

PART V

MAN CREATED AND RUINED

CHAPTER XVII

CREATED AND UNDER PROBATION

133. LIFE, as we see it, is always clothed in a distinctive garb, marked by a variety far greater than that presented by lifeless matter, yet in all forms, animal and vegetable, most closely related in chemical composition, cellular structure, and even in the functions of life. Living bodies differ from all others in their great DEPENDENCE ON their ENVIRONMENT, in their need of food, their growth and reproduction, and their liability to change and decay. Without air and food, or if exposed to extremes of temperature, the distinctive features of life will cease, and animal bodies will in time go back to the simpler forms of inorganic matter.

The phenomena of life, especially human life, reveal the presence in living bodies of an UNSEEN element quite different from the material in which it dwells. This is made very conspicuous by DEATH, which is the cessation of the phenomena of life. In some cases, without any perceptible change in the visible organism, through change of environment, the functions of life have irrevocably ceased; and in a short time the distinctive features of life vanish, and the once active body returns to the dust. Evidently, in animals, and far more in man, are two elements belonging to two worlds, yet interpenetrating at every point, a BODY akin to the graveyard sod and an invisible SPIRIT akin to God.

The binding link is life. When this is broken, each element returns in its own direction: Eccl. 12^7.

134. This unseen element is, as the seat of intelligence, of the moral sense, and of all that makes man superior to animals, infinitely GREATER than the body. We can conceive the man as existing when the body has been resolved into dust; but not after the functions of mind have finally ceased.

Yet the whole of human life and the entire activity of man are conditioned by his body, and subject to the laws of ANIMAL LIFE. We are compelled to spend hours each day in sleep, and to spend time in obtaining food. This last involves toil and often hardship and peril. The peculiar structure of our bodies, making us dependent on the mysterious laws of animal life and on our environment near and remote, exposes us to anxiety and pain, and will some day bring us to the grave. The whole of human life is limited, and more or less shaped, by our material clothing.

In animals, the body reigns supreme as the one determining principle of their whole being. They live "according to flesh," and in so doing attain the highest well-being possible to them. Their manifest destiny is to live, feed, grow, beget offspring, and die.

In man, such a life is at once felt to be unworthy and degrading. He is capable of better things: and to these he must rise, or sink into intellectual and moral ruin. All experience teaches that, for the well-being of both body and spirit, the SPIRIT MUST RULE and the body obey: and all education has for its aim the control of the body by the spirit, this including the intelligence and the moral sense. The normal human life is one in which the body is the submissive organ for the self-manifestation of the unseen spirit within.

135. In O.T. and N.T. the above contrast is conspicuous. We have (1) the FLESH, the material common to all human bodies, and in a different form to animals; (2) the *body*, the organism belonging to each; with its various *members*: and (3) the *soul*, the seat of life, the *spirit* or principle of life, and the *mind*, the organ of thought. Note the contrast of SPIRIT and *soul* in 1 Cor. 2^{14}, 15^{44f}, 1 Th. 5^{23}. The evil influence of the body is conspicuous in Gal. $5^{16\text{-}26}$, 6^{8}, Rom. $8^{4\text{-}9}$, 6^{12}. This use of the word *flesh*, which denotes primarily the material peculiar to a living body, suggests or proves that in Paul's thought the body, owing to its peculiar constitution, exerts or tends to exert an immoral influence over the spirit within.

Since human life on earth is never found apart from flesh, and since the entire activity of man is limited by the body, the word FLESH describes the ENTIRE MAN and sometimes the entire race: so Joel 2^{28}, Acts 2^{17}, Rom. 3^{20}, Mt. 16^{17}, etc. This use is another witness to the importance of the material constitution of the body as a great factor in human life. Evidently the far-reaching relation of body and spirit belongs to man as he sprang from God. This is conspicuously asserted in Gen. 2^{7}.

136. We soon detect in our bodily life certain inevitable alternative SEQUENCES which determine the consequences of our own actions, *e.g.* pleasure or pain, health or sickness, life or death. These sequences, we call laws of nature; the word *law* denoting here the uniform action of natural forces.

Other sequences, equally inevitable and beyond man's control, and vastly more important, are observed in the MORAL LIFE of men, *e.g.* of sin and shame and moral degradation, of right doing and self-respect and clearer moral vision and greater moral strength. These sequences

differ from the former class in that they evoke a conception unique in human thought, viz. our deep sense of MORAL OBLIGATION. Through them speaks, approving or condemning, a supreme authority from whose judgment there is neither appeal nor escape. This MORAL LAW or MORAL SENSE claims unreserved allegiance. Sometimes, in obedience to it, we are bound, under penalty of self-condemnation and moral degradation, to set at nought all material consequences and to act in a way injurious or possibly destructive to the body. For moral sequences differ from the laws of the material world in that these last are not, whereas the Moral Law is, a final rule of human action. Evidently, just as water is the natural environment of fishes and air that of birds, outside of which they cannot live, so there is marked out for man, in his own moral sense, a path along which alone he can attain his highest well-being.

Already, in ch. 2, we have traced the indisputable and absolute authority of the moral sense to the intelligent Author of the universe and of man. If so, the moral sense is an all-important influence, from the Author of our being, drawing us towards and along the only path in which we can attain our highest well-being.

137. Other influences draw us in an opposite direction. Frequently the pressing needs of bodily life can apparently be supplied only by DISOBEYING the law written within. Forbidden objects are often pleasant or apparently helpful. Sometimes the moral law alone seems to stand between a man and all earthly good: at other times, the path marked out by the moral law leads to hardship or peril or death. Thus in ourselves we find powerful influences prompting that which our moral sense condemns. These influences tend to mould our entire thought and activity, and to make our whole life a striving for material good. And, since

the objects we need are only in small part under our control, our need of them becomes frequently a degrading bondage to things infinitely inferior to ourselves.

138. These mutually antagonistic influences reveal an element in man distinct from each of them, viz. our own inborn power to SELECT, from an alternative open to us, ACTION which thus becomes in every sense our own. A voice within speaks to us from above with an authority we cannot question: another speaks with the authority of those material conditions which rule our bodily life. To one or other, we must submit: to which, rests with ourselves. Upon this choice depends our highest well-being or deepest moral degradation. This prerogative of self-determination is a conspicuous feature of man as distinguished from all other visible objects; and, as such, a distinctive and all-important element in PERSONALITY: see § 120.

We saw in ch. 2 that the moral sense belongs to man as he sprang from God. To Him must also be traced man's mysterious prerogative of PERSONAL CHOICE: so also his dependence on bodily life and on his environment. This last is not disproved by the immoral influence of the body on those who make it the aim of life. The needs and desires of the body injure us only when they usurp a place for which they were not designed, and become the ruling principle in man. Kept in submission to the dictates of the moral sense, they afford a most valuable moral discipline, and open to man a moral growth otherwise impossible.

139. The only explanation of the FACTS OF HUMAN NATURE is that He who made man gave to him a freedom of personal choice and action like the freedom of His own activity, thus making him the sole arbiter of his own action and destiny; that He inwove into human intelligence an authoritative guide

of action, and put man in a body dependent on its material surroundings, thus compelling him to choose whether to yield allegiance to that in him which he knows is most fit to rule or to that which he knows is designed to obey. From indisputable facts of human nature to-day, we find that man as originally created consisted of two elements, one closely akin to his Creator, the other akin to the lower animals and like them dependent on the material world; that between these very different, and in some measure hostile, elements was placed a personal power of self-determination; that each of these elements tends to control man's choice and action; and that all this was ordained by God in order to test man's loyalty to that in him which is noblest and best and which ever leads him upwards, in order that by personal moral victory man may ever rise towards God.

140. As a practical equivalent to "the law written in their hearts," we have in Rom. 2^{15} the word CONSCIENCE: same word in ch. 9^{1}, 13^{5}, 1 Cor. $8^{7, 10, 12}$, $10^{25, 27, 28, 29}$, 2 Cor. 1^{12}, 4^{2}, 5^{11}, 1 Tim. $1^{5, 19}$, 3^{9}, 4^{2}, 2 Tim. 1^{3}, Tit. 1^{15}, Heb. $9^{9, 14}$, $10^{2, 22}$, 13^{18}, 1 Pet. 2^{19}, $3^{16, 21}$. It denotes etymologically (συνείδησις) knowledge shared with another, and in later Greek the secrets of one's own heart, especially his moral judgments and his inner knowledge of himself. The *law* written *in the heart* may be distinguished as the objective norm of action inwoven into man's thought; the *conscience* as the mental faculty by which a man compares with this standard the alternative courses open to him, and which compels him, after action, to pronounce judgment on the course chosen and on him who chose it. As approving or condemning, the conscience is called *good* and *pure* or *defiled*. To this faculty of moral discrimination, all moral teaching appeals; and by it must be judged. It is the most precious element surviving in fallen mankind. As an inborn faculty distinguishing between

right and wrong, as the bodily *senses* of *taste* and *sight* distinguish bitter from sweet and black from white, it may be suitably called the MORAL SENSE.

141. All this by no means implies the INFALLIBILITY of a man's moral judgments. For the law written in the heart may be misinterpreted by human fallibility, just as much as the law written in the Sacred Books. Still less does it place the authority of the moral sense above that of the Bible. Each of these is supreme in its own sphere, and each recognises the authority of the other. Every one is bound to obey, till better instructed, the voice of conscience. But that in us which is noblest and best pays lowly homage to Christ as He is portrayed in the New Testament. Moreover the recorded words of Christ both strengthen the authority of the voice within and give us power to obey it. Indeed, in His followers, the two voices are blended. We cannot distinguish practically between the voice of conscience and that which speaks to us from the Cross and the Throne.

For these reasons, the moral sense CLAIMS A HEARING in theology. It is not superseded by, any more than it can override, the authority of Christ speaking to us in the New Testament. If these authorities seem to us sometimes to be in conflict, we must seek, by patient and reverent attention to each voice, for the harmony which underlies whatever comes from God. This harmony, thus found, is the only absolute authority.

That the moral sense is a wonderful witness for God as a moral Ruler, we have already learnt in ch. 2. As an all important factor in the spiritual life of man, we shall meet it again in §§ 145, 151–160, 182, 306, 362.

CHAPTER XVIII

SIN AND BONDAGE

142. THE various N.T. writers assert and assume frequently that all men have actually COMMITTED SIN: *e.g.* Rom. $3^{9\text{-}23}$. To prove this assertion, is needless and useless. The moral literature of the world is an acknowledgment of universal sin. But, unless we are immediately conscious of our own personal sin, neither the abundant testimony of moralists nor the authority of the Bible will convince us.

143. That all men are not only guilty of *past sin* but are in PRESENT BONDAGE to sin, is assumed in Rom. $6^{6,\ 12}$. The long contrast in *vv.*$^{17\text{-}22}$ implies that all men were once held fast by a power hostile to righteousness and compelling them to pursue a path of sin. That this bondage is recognised by LAW, *i.e.* that it is a punishment prescribed by the Law for personal transgression, is taught in Rom. $7^{1\text{-}4}$, where Paul compares his readers to a woman formerly bound by law to her husband but now set free by his death.

A more full and graphic account of this bondage is given in *vv.*$^{14\text{-}25}$, where Paul is compelled to infer, from his vain efforts to do what he knows is good, that an enemy has entered, not into his country or his house, but into his own body, and within the citadel of his own inner life is carrying on war against him and is leading him helpless into captivity. This picture of moral bondage is confirmed by ch. $1^{24,\ 26,\ 28}$, where three times we read that "God gave up" the heathen to shameful sin. Cp. Eph. 4^{19}.

Similar teaching from the lips of Christ, in Jno. $8^{32\text{-}36}$. To some who had put faith in Him, Christ promises, "the

truth shall make you free." This they resented as implying present bondage. But Christ justifies His promise of liberation by a universal statement, "everyone that does sin is a slave of sin." This implies that apart from the Gospel all men are committing sin and are, according to Christ's universal principle, slaves of sin. For, unless all men are sinners and in bondage, this general assertion would not prove that the persons in question need liberation.

This emphatic teaching of Paul and of Christ is confirmed by a wide-spread experience. Every action tends to form a habit; every sin, to form a HABIT OF SIN. Our past life is a present power urging us along our former path. In this abiding influence of past sin, we trace the mysterious and tremendous POWER OF EVIL. To this present power of past sins, the literature of all ages and the annals of crime bear abundant testimony. Multitudes have felt themselves to be carried along and downwards by immoral forces in themselves which they were unable to resist: and all have found it impossible to do right except by strenuous resistance to a hostile force within.

144. In Eph. $1^{1\text{-}3}$, the readers are said to have been formerly "DEAD through trespasses." They walked in a path shaped by the course of things around, by the material world and the present age, directed by the inward influence of a spiritual potentate. They moved "among the sons of disobedience," and were working out their own desires, bodily or intellectual. In so doing, they were "children of wrath," *i.e.* men under the anger of God, "like the rest" of men. That in *v.*[5] Paul repeats *v.*[1], and then goes on to speak of a new life from God, suggests that *vv.*[2, 3] are an exposition of "dead through trespasses:" cp. Col. 2^{13}, 1 Tim. 5^{6}. Same thought, viz. that sin and the anger of God involve spiritual *death*, is found in Jno 3^{36}, 5^{24}.

This METAPHOR, common to Paul and John, deserves careful attention. Life is the normal condition of organic matter: of this normal condition, death is the absolute and final cessation. At death, all functions of life cease, the body falls a helpless prey to corruption, and returns more or less quickly to the simpler conditions of inorganic matter. Death puts a man beyond reach of human help, for which we seek till death extinguishes hope.

These ideas we must cautiously transfer to the men said to be "dead through trespasses." This phrase can only mean that they are in the abnormal state of a moral corpse, beyond human help, a helpless prey to ever-increasing corruption, and this in consequence of their sins and of God's anger against sin.

Here a caution is necessary. A corpse is unconscious of things around, and they who live in sin are more or less indifferent to the great unseen realities. But no analogy is valid at every point. A corpse can no more hinder than help its own resurrection. On the other hand, the whole N.T. teaching implies (see §§ 306–309) that salvation is altogether conditional on man's free self-surrender to divine influences. Those who are dead through trespasses have still a conscious existence. Probably none are unconscious of influences drawing them towards the good; or are unmoved by them. All that the metaphor fairly implies is that sinners are as powerless to save themselves as is a corpse to rescue itself from the inevitable decay which follows death.

This powerlessness to save finds expression in Rom. 8^8; where Paul says that those controlled by their bodily life cannot, by any moral excellence of their own, gain the favour of God.

145. The above teaching of universal sin, bondage, death,

and moral powerlessness does not imply that, even in those who have neglected the Gospel, there is NOTHING GOOD; but only that they are utterly unable to save themselves. And abundant evidence attests that the moral sense remains, distorted and weakened but not silent, in very many, probably in all, who daily break the moral law. In Rom. $7^{15, 19}$ Paul says (see my *Commentary*) that he hates the evil which he does, and desires, though vainly, to do good, while yet led captive by an irresistible power within. Similar witness has been given in all ages. This desire to do right and reluctance to sin are elements of good in fallen man.

These unavailing efforts are prompted by divine influences. In Rom. 2^4 Paul blames a man, whom he describes as hard-hearted and impenitent, for not knowing that God is leading him to repentance. This implies that on all men God is exerting this influence. For, if there were exceptions, the man to whom Paul appeals might be one. Apart from such divine influences, none can come to Christ: Jno. 6^{44}.

Doubtless the inborn moral sense is a chief instrument by which God draws men towards repentance and Christ. If so, it is an essential part of God's purpose of salvation in Christ. In other words, the Fall (see ch. 19) left in man by the mercy of God, injured, but not destroyed, an element which God thought fit to use for his restoration. To this source, we may attribute much in ancient literature which evokes our sincere admiration.

This element of moral good in the HEATHEN is referred to in Rom. $2^{14, 26f}$. Here we have a condition derived "from nature" (ἐκ φύσεως), *i.e.* inherited by birth; and men who "by nature" (φύσει as in Eph. 2^3), *i.e.* guided only by forces born in them, do the things prescribed in the Law. This implies not only possible but actual cases. But such obedience is only fragmentary, and insufficient to win the

favour of God: "for they that are in flesh cannot please God." It is however sufficient to condemn a disobedient and impenitent Jew: Rom. 2^{17}.

CHAPTER XIX

THE FIRST FALL AND ITS RESULTS

146. UNIVERSAL sin and bondage suggest irresistibly an INBORN FAULT in human nature. And this is supported by Eph. 2^{3}, "*by-nature* children of wrath, as also the others." This implies that both Jews and Gentiles, while formerly pursuing a path of sin which brought them under the *anger* of God, were guided *by-nature*, *i.e.* by forces born in them as distinguished from influences received since birth, and that in this they were like other men; in other words, that the nature common to all men and received by birth contains in it a TENDENCY TO SIN. But it does not imply that God is angry with men because of the moral state in which they were born. The actual ground of His anger is given in the words foregoing: "doing the desires, etc." The word *by-nature* traces these actual sins to an inborn moral fault. So Ps. $51^{4,5}$.

That the moral nature inherited by man at birth is radically defective, is taught also in Jno. $3^{5,6}$, where Christ asserts that the nature derived from human parents is incapable, apart from new life from above, of the blessedness awaiting the people of God. So Job 15^{14}.

That man was created with this bias to sin, we cannot believe. A change has taken place. We seek for it.

147. That human SIN is LATER THAN human LIFE, is

implied in Rom. 5^{12ff}, which points to a definite transgression by which sin "entered into the world." This refers evidently to Gen. 3, where we find man placed under a definite probation, exposed to a definite temptation, guilty of a definite sin, and under a definite curse. The whole narrative depicts this first sin as a new and evil era in the history of our race. Cp. 1 Tim. 2^{14}.

That this first transgression was followed by BODILY DEATH, is clearly taught in Rom. $12^{12\text{-}17}$, 1 Cor. 15^{21f}; and is implied in Jno. 8^{44}. It is also taught in Sir. 25^{24}, Wisdom 2^{23}. But neither in O.T. nor elsewhere in N.T. is the universal reign of death traced expressly and clearly to Adam's sin.

In Gen. 2^{17} death is the threatened penalty of sin: and as matter of fact all men die. Now, as we have just seen, Paul teaches that their death is a result of Adam's sin. If so, the punishment threatened to Adam may be said to have been inflicted on all his CHILDREN. In this sense, his sin was *imputed* or *reckoned* to them; not that God looked upon them as though they had committed sin long before they were born, but that he laid on them the punishment threatened to their father in case of disobedience. Cp. Phlm.^{18}. All this cannot have been an arbitrary act of God. We infer therefore that Adam's descendants stood to him in a relation so close that the punishment of death threatened to him fell also on them.

148. That other equally wide-spread results followed this first transgression, will soon appear.

In § 143 we learnt from Paul and from Christ that to commit sin is to surrender oneself a slave to the power of sin; and found that this teaching is confirmed by the general experience of mankind. This universal sequence must have determined the effect of Adam's first sin. Indeed all

experience teaches that the first step in a wrong path has consequences most serious. Frequently the entire subsequent downward course seems to be an almost inevitable result of one wrong act. All analogy teaches that by his first sin Adam fell into bondage to sin: and this result must have been a divinely ordained and inflicted punishment of that first disobedience. If so, the punishment of Adam was twofold, viz. death BODILY and SPIRITUAL, *i.e.* surrender of his body after a few years of toil and pain to the worms, and immediate surrender of his spirit to moral bondage.

That the former part of the penalty is inflicted on all Adam's children, is plainly asserted and argued by Paul. We have also noticed that the second part of it, viz. moral bondage, is as WIDE-SPREAD as is the first part, viz. the doom of death; and that this universal moral bondage is, in the Bible, traced here and there to a moral fault inherited at birth; just as bodily death is due to an inherited bodily constitution. This inherited fault cannot be an immediate work of God. Some evil influence has come between the original creation of man and the birth of men as we know them. What this evil influence is, we cannot doubt.

If our mortality is due to Adam's sin, to the same source must be traced this universal MORAL DEFECT. We therefore infer with confidence that by his first sin our father sold his body to death and his spirit to moral bondage. "In Adam all die:" and we "were by nature children of wrath as also the rest."

149. This inference is supported by our observation that bodily defects, leading often to death, and tendencies to sin, leading often to immoral lives, may often be traced from father to son. This must be by the ordinance of Him who has linked together moral sequences. If so, the inheritance, by all men, of Adam's sin is but the earliest and farthest-

reaching example of a principle apparently co-extensive with human life, and perhaps with all life.

The apparent INJUSTICE of these sequences is removed in Rom. $5^{12\text{-}19}$, 1 Cor. 15^{21f}, where in Christ we see reversed not only the inherited result of Adam's sin but the result of our own many sins. The solidarity involved in our relation to Adam brings temporary hardship to individuals. But it is a gain to the race as a whole, and especially to everyone who accepts the free gift offered to all men in Christ.

Neither the above inferences nor Gen. 2 and 3 imply or suggest a LONG PERIOD of INNOCENCE. The first recorded moral act of man was sin. Earlier than this, we have only the intellectual discrimination involved in the names given to animals, a valuable indication that intelligence was earlier than sin.

The above arguments admit that the doctrine that human depravity is due to Adam's sin is not clearly asserted in the Bible; and is therefore no part of Christ's message to men. But it seems to me a fair inference from Paul's teaching that bodily death is due to this cause, taken in connection with other casual statements in the Bible read in the light of the facts of sin. The apostles were more eager to convict men of their own personal sin than to propound a theory of the origin of human depravity.

150. A serious objection to Paul's teaching that all men die because Adam sinned is the close relation between the death of animals and of man, taken in connection with decisive geological evidence that ANIMALS DIED LONG BEFORE MAN EXISTED.

But Natural Science cannot explain the UNIQUE SUPERIORITY of the intelligence and moral sense of man as compared with the lower animals, except by the inbreathing of a higher life from a supernatural Source. Evidently this higher life

was designed to rule the lower and animal life in man: and the welfare of man was made conditional on the submission of the lower to the higher. Need we wonder that also the continuance of human life in the form originally given was made subject to the same condition? Certainly, He who at first breathed this higher life into a body related to those of animals, thus raising him infinitely above them, could have maintained in man this higher life even in spite of death reigning over all lower animals.

If this suggestion be correct, man was created neither mortal nor immortal, but LIVING; his continued life being contingent on his own action, just as his highest welfare, and to some extent his continued bodily life, are contingent now. Two elements in man claimed dominion over him; his moral sense speaking through his intelligence with the authority of God, and the needs and desires of a bodily life akin to that of animals. Had he obeyed the voice divine, we may infer that obedience would have raised him above the doom of death, to which animals are subject. But he yielded to that in him akin to animals and fell under the doom under which all animals lie. Consequently, Adam's death was a result of his own sin: for, had he not sinned, he would not have died. And the wide prevalence of heredity in human life makes it easy to believe that his mortality was inherited by his descendants. If so, the universality of death to-day is, as Paul teaches, a result of Adam's sin.

Against this suggestion, unsupported though it is by scientific evidence, Natural Science has nothing to say. For the origin of reason and of the moral sense lies beyond its ken, in the realm of the unseen.

151. The above double picture of man, as fallen yet not without a WITNESS FOR GOD even in his fallen nature, embrac

all the known facts of the case. The terrible prevalence of sin, and a wide experience that men do right only by personal victory over a deeply implanted tendency to evil, are explained by the teaching that all men inherit a nature prone to sin. This evil inheritance, a result of Adam's sin, will be harmonized with the justice and love of God by teaching that in Christ we are made sharers of a new immortal life of victory over sin. On the other hand, all moral excellence in man, even in men not directly and consciously saved by the Gospel, is explained by the inborn moral sense and by divine influences leading men back towards the path marked out for them by God.

The above results indicate clearly the SALVATION NEEDED by man. He needs pardon for past sins, and restoration to the favour of God lost through sin. But, since God smiles only on those who obey His commands, which the unsaved cannot do, we need also deliverance from moral bondage, from the mighty hostile powers leading us astray. And, inasmuch as bodily death is a result of Adam's sin, this rescue will not be complete till the body laid dead in the grave is raised to endless life in the presence of God.

It will be observed that the results gained in PART V. do not rest, only or chiefly, on the authority and teaching of the Bible; but on moral phenomena observed in the inner and outer life of men. They receive however important confirmation from the moral literature of the race, and important elucidation from the teaching of the Bible.

PART VI

THE GOSPEL OF PARDON

CHAPTER XX

THE LAW

152. We come now to consider the steps by which God built up, from the ruins of fallen humanity, His Kingdom among men, the temple of His Church, destined to become the eternal City of God.

In ch. 38, we shall find that this rescue of fallen man and his moral and spiritual development are the accomplishment of an eternal purpose. The successive steps of its accomplishment, we shall now review.

Already (§§ 10-12, 136) we have found, in the INBORN MORAL SENSE of man as originally created, a divinely-implanted influence leading him in the path of right, and towards God. This voice of God is audible even in man's deep fall; and is an all-important element operative at every point of his salvation. To this original and universal revelation of God in the moral nature of man appeal, and upon it rest, the later historical revelations. Insufficient of itself to save, it is a necessary forerunner of the salvation foretold by the prophets and announced by Christ.

153. In the narrative of man's sad fall, we find a PROMISE of ultimate VICTORY. In Enoch and Noah we see men walking with God. After the Flood, God makes a covenant with man, implying His favour and encouraging hope.

An important era begins with the call and obedience of

ABRAHAM, who becomes a conspicuous object-lesson of a man living and moving on earth under the guidance of an unseen Power. With him and his descendants, God enters into an abiding COVENANT, promising to be a friend to their friends and a foe of their foe, and to enrich them with blessings which will reach to all the families on earth. The Kingdom of God thus took permanent VISIBLE FORM before the eyes of men, as a pledge of blessings to come. And this prospect of infinite blessing for Israel and for all nations runs through the O.T. as a conspicuous feature of the religious thought and life of Israel, in contrast to all other ancient nations. This unique hope, passing far the faint hopes cherished here and there in the nations around, is a clear indication of a supernatural revelation from God to Israel.

154. Another important era begins with the Exodus, the giving of THE LAW, and the institution of the priestly ritual. The deep impression made by these events upon the thought of Israel, as reflected in nearly the whole of its literature, is complete proof that through Moses, in a marvellous way, God rescued Israel from the land of bondage, gave to them important moral teaching, a civil code, and a complicated ritual, these to be henceforth the basis of God's dealings with them.

Nearly the whole of the moral teaching of the Pentateuch claims at once the homage of our moral sense, and elevates and strengthens it: *e.g.* Dt. 6^5, 30^6, Lv. 19^{18}. Certain other elements in the O.T. bear marks of human imperfection: *e.g.* Ps. 137^9. But, taken as a whole, both the civil legislation and the moral teaching of the O.T. are immensely superior to any contemporary literature. In other words, in Israel we find the morality common to all races confirmed, strengthened, and supplemented by a further historical revelation.

This earlier revelation, the N.T. writers recognise; and they

accept as authoritative the recorded words of God to Israel: so Rom. 5^{20}, Gal. $3^{17\ 19}$.

Thus to Israel the abstract principle of law, viz. that God claims to direct man's action and will give back to everyone according to his works, assumed at Sinai concrete HISTORICAL form: and, in the records of God's commands, it assumed LITERARY form. Cp. Dt. 30^{10}, Josh. 1^{8}, 8^{34}, 2 Kgs. $22^{8.\ 11}$, Neh. 8^{1}. The book itself, as a permanent embodiment of God's will, is called THE LAW: 1 Kgs. 2^{3}, 1 Chr. 16^{40}, 2 Chr. 23^{18}, 31^{3}, 35^{26}, Ezra 3^{2}: so Rom. 3^{21}, Lk. 24^{44}, Acts 24^{14}. Notice Rom. 3^{19}, Jno. 15^{25}.

A dominant principle of the O.T. is DO THIS AND LIVE: cp. Rom. 10^{5}. This is the spirit, the books are the body, of the Law. And the word *law* refers sometimes to its inner spirit, at other times to its outer and literary form. Hence the apparent variety in the use of the work.

155. Of the same broad principle of right as binding on all men, all HUMAN LEGISLATION is an embodiment. But since the Gentiles had no written law given by a superhuman lawgiver, the word *law* had to them no historical significance. In this sense, they were "without law:" Rom. $2^{12,\ 14}$, 1 Cor. 9^{21}. Thus the gift of a written law to Israel divided our race into two great divisions. Yet all men everywhere will be judged by law, ISRAEL by that of Moses, the GENTILES by that written in their hearts: Rom. $2^{12\text{-}15}$.

To this inner law, all outer law appeals, and from it derives authority. Indeed the moral sense compels us to accept as the voice of God the main principles of O.T. moral teaching, and much other teaching which in its historical origin is purely human. This inner law is (§ 141) by no means infallible, and needs to be instructed: but, till better instructed, it is the supreme rule of human obligation. On the other hand, the voice within is greatly strengthened by

external authority. The voice from without wakes up, and gives fresh authority to, the voice within.

156. To men guilty of past sin and unable to obey in the future, and therefore needing both pardon and moral liberation, God gave a written translation of the law already interwoven into their moral nature. But such a LAW CANNOT SAVE. It is powerless to save, because man is both guilty and powerless to obey: Rom. 8^3. To the guilty, it speaks only condemnation; and gives no help to those unable to fulfil its commands. The first result, in men of keen moral sensibility, is intense and painful effort to obey: for the external law wakes up echoes within. And, as each strenuous effort to do right only reveals the presence of an inward and hostile power compelling the sinner to continue in wrong doing, he is left helpless and trembling beneath a voice of thunder from which there is no escape. Others of looser moral fibre, finding themselves unable to obey, acquiesce in their failure; and in their felt moral weakness abandon themselves to sin. Others again select from the Law such details as they can obey; and, in spite of the Law's demand for observance of all its precepts, trust for the Judge's favour to a fragmentary obedience. Thus in every case the Law fails to save; an inevitable result of the gift of a spiritual law to men under bondage to sin.

Is then the Law a FAILURE? If so, it must have been a foreseen and designed failure: for God knew who they were to whom He gave the Law, and foresaw the inevitable result of His gift. Why then did He give a law which could not save? The only answer is that beyond apparent failure lies a FURTHER PURPOSE for whose accomplishment the apparent failure was designed to prepare the way: and this is stated expressly in Rom. 3^{19}. The Law was given in order to produce in all men a consciousness of personal guilt;

and (ch. 5^{20}) in order that Adam's one transgression of a definite command might multiply into the many similar transgressions of his descendants, thus revealing the infinite evil of sin as it could not have been revealed had no definite commands been given. In Gal. 3^{22}, Paul asserts plainly that the Law was given in order to prepare a way for the Gospel.

157. Such then were God's first steps to save men. After a promise to Abraham of blessings designed for all mankind, God spoke the Law from Sinai, and made obedience to it a condition of His favour, in order to reveal to men their absolute need of a salvation infinitely beyond all that they can do, that thus they may appreciate and desire the salvation announced by Christ and the wisdom and love therein manifested.

Notice here, in addition to the moral purpose of the Law written in the hearts of all men or in the O.T., a further evangelical purpose, viz. to prepare a way for the Gospel. In this double purpose, we see the relation of MORALS to RELIGION.

CHAPTER XXI

THE MORAL TEACHING OF CHRIST

158. As His teaching is recorded in the N.T., Christ TAKES OVER, develops, and supplements all the teaching of NATURAL THEOLOGY, as embodied in the O.T. and in ancient Gentile literature. He spoke frequently about a FATHER IN HEAVEN, the intelligent Creator of the universe and the righteous Ruler of all men, taking deep interest in man and coming

near to him to save and bless, an object of man's trust and affection, and a source of hope and joy. In all this, we notice a definite advance on the O.T., itself so much in advance of all Gentile literature.

A conspicuous feature of the N.T. as compared with the O.T. (where see Eccl. 12^{14}, Dan. 12^{1f}) is its teaching about a judgment to come, *i.e.* an absolute RETRIBUTION beyond the grave for all actions done on earth: § 483. Christ thus anticipates and confirms our own inference in ch. 3; an inference anticipated still earlier, in a measure far surpassing the O.T., by very much teaching of the ancient world: §§ 477–480. Thus Christ builds upon a foundation of truth already laid in the intuitions of the moral sense and in the earlier revelation to Israel.

159. The discourses of Christ are full of MORAL TEACHING: see especially the great inaugural in Mt. 5-7, so prominent a feature of the 1st Gospel. He not only announces retribution beyond the grave but tells His hearers what they must do and leave undone in order to escape punishment and gain eternal life. Now all moral teaching must be judged at the bar of the moral sense. For, as we saw in §§ 136, 140f, this is the supreme judge of human action. We ask at once, What is the judgment pronounced on the moral teaching of Christ by the judge enthroned in every heart?

160. The judgment is decisive. The entire moral teaching of Christ and of the N.T. commends itself as right and good and lofty. It does more. The teaching of Jesus enriches and elevates and strengthens our own moral sense, gives to us a loftier ideal of human excellence, and gives to this ideal absolute authority as henceforth the law of our life. In His presence, the judge enthroned within, the supreme arbiter to us of right and wrong, bows as in the presence of One greater than himself, and at his bidding mounts a still loftier throne.

A Voice which thus raises and strengthens that in us which is loftiest and best reveals itself manifestly as that of our Lord and Master.

The details of this impression cannot be reproduced here. Notice, however, the dignified simplicity of teaching which, instead of small details, asserts BROAD PRINCIPLES capable of universal application. Morality is summed up as unreserved LOYALTY TO GOD and His kingdom, and active GOOD-WILL TO MEN. And it claims as its domain the INWARD as well as the outward life of men. That some of the noblest words of Christ, *e.g.* Mt. $22^{37\text{-}39}$, are from the O T., shows to how large an extent the earlier revelation to Israel anticipated the supreme revelation given in Christ.

161. Moreover, in the picture of Christ presented in the N.T., we see a PERFECT EMBODIMENT in real life of this lofty moral ideal. We see a man whose one thought is to complete the work for which God sent Him into the world, and to enrich with highest blessing all who are willing to receive it; an object of unceasing and unscrupulous conspiracy, yet never uttering a word of resentment. We see the Eternal Son of God (ch. 11) laying aside the prerogatives of deity, taking upon Himself the limitations and weakness of human life on earth, and surrendering Himself to a cruel death in order to save men (ch. 24) from the penalty of their sins and to give them eternal life. Compared with this infinitely costly devotion to God and love to man, all other acts of obedience or beneficence sink into insignificance. In Jesus, as depicted in the N.T., we have, without defect and surpassing the thought of man, a perfect and unique embodiment of the highest human excellence.

162. That our moral sense recognises the absolute authority of the moral teaching and the example of Christ, is an important confirmation of His teaching about our Father in

heaven and retribution beyond the grave. For One whose moral teaching we dare not reject cannot be in serious error touching matters bearing so closely on morals. Thus our own inferences in chs. 1–3 are confirmed, not only by the express teaching (§ 158) of Christ, but by the grandeur and authority of His moral teaching: and His teaching is confirmed (ch. 4) by its effect upon the world and by the unique superiority of the Christian nations. Teaching thus doubly confirmed has for us supreme authority.

163. The moral teaching of Christ does little directly to SUPPLY OUR DEEP SPIRITUAL NEED. It has no voice of pardon, and gives no liberation from moral bondage. Indeed the lofty teaching and example of Christ rather make us feel how far and how inexcusably we have fallen below the ideal to which we ought to have risen. Even our efforts after amendment do little more than reveal our utter powerlessness. We lie condemned and helpless in the presence of a Pattern we cannot imitate. So far Christ has but re-echoed, with higher authority, the Law which condemns us. Yet His words are full of mercy: Mt. $11^{28\text{-}30}$. We wait to see whether the mercy of God will find for the guilty a way of pardon, and for the captives deliverance from bondage.

CHAPTER XXII

THE PARDON OF SINS, THROUGH FAITH

164. IN Ex. 34^{7}, Nm. $14^{18\text{-}20}$, God speaks of Himself as pardoning sin: and in Lv. $4^{20,\ 26,\ 31,\ 35}$ provision is made for the pardon of certain sins by sacrificial atonement. In Isa. 55^{7} an abundant pardon is announced for the wicked

who turn to God: and in Jer. 31^{34} pardon of sin is promised under the New Covenant which in later days God will make with Israel. And in Pss. $32^{1, 2}$, 103^{3} we hear the blessedness of him whose sin is forgiven and praise to God who forgives all iniquities. In Ps. 51 we have a pathetic cry for a purification which involves forgiveness. In the above, and other passages similar, we see reflected the felt need for pardon and the joy of the pardoned. But the way of pardon for all sins is not made clear.

165. In Mk. 1^{4}, Lk. 3^{3} the forerunner of Christ announces a "baptism of repentance for pardon of sins." In the Lord's Prayer, Christ bids His disciples say, "forgive us our sins:" Lk. 11^{4}, Mt. 6^{12}. In Mt. 9^{2-6}, Mk. 2^{5-10}, Lk. 5^{20-24} Christ works a miracle in order to prove that He "has authority to forgive sins." Cp. Mt. 12^{31}, Mk. 11^{25}. At the institution of the Supper He speaks of His "blood being shed for many for pardon of sins:" Mt. 26^{28}. After His resurrection (Lk. 24^{47}) He says, "the Christ must needs suffer and be raised . . . and repentance for pardon of sins be preached in His name to all the nations." These conspicuous passages prove that, in the thought of the Synoptists, pardon of sins was an important element in the teaching of Christ.

In the 1st Gospel, the condition of pardon is not clearly stated. In Mt. $7^{21, 24}$, 19^{17}, obedience is the condition of salvation. On the other hand, in Mt. 8^{10}, Lk. 7^{9}; Mt. 9^{2}, etc.; *v.*^{22}, etc.; *v.*^{28f}; ch. 15^{28}; 17^{20}; 21^{21f}, Mk. 11^{22f}; Lk. 18^{42}, FAITH is conspicuously the condition of blessing and of spiritual power. In Mk. 1^{15} Christ opens His ministry by bidding men to "repent and believe the Gospel:" so Lk. 8^{12}.

166. In the 4th Gospel, faith is still more conspicuous, as a condition of the favour of God. cp. chs. $1^{7, 12}$, $2^{11, 22}$.

In ch. 3^{15-18}, in what is evidently an initial epitome of His teaching, Christ announces with conspicuous repetition ETERNAL LIFE for all who BELIEVE IN HIM: so again, *v.*^{36}. The same teaching, in almost the same words, is repeated in chs. 5^{24}, $6^{29, 35, 40, 47}$, 7^{38f}, 8^{24}, $11^{25, 26}$, 12^{46}, 14^{12}, 20^{31}: cp. 1 Jno. 3^{23}, $5^{1, 5, 10, 13}$. These and other similar passages are decisive proof that the evangelist, who gives every indication of being a most accurate eye-witness, understood that Christ announced emphatically "eternal life" for all who put faith in Him. Now the penalty of sin is death. Consequently, "eternal life" for all who believe involves the pardon of their sins. In other words, the above teaching implies that all who believe are forgiven: cp. Jno. 20^{23}; 1 Jno. 1^{9}, 2^{12}. They "have passed out of death into life:" Jno. 5^{24}.

At Pentecost, Peter bids his hearers "repent and be baptized . . . for pardon of sins:" Acts 2^{38}. In ch. 10^{43}, he appeals to the prophets in proof that "all who believe in Him will obtain pardon of sins." Cp. 1 Pet. $1^{5, 7, 8}$, 5^{9}.

167. In Acts 13^{38}, 26^{18}; Rom. 4^{6-8} from Ps. 32^{1f}, Eph. 1^{7}, Col. 1^{14}, 2^{13}, PAUL teaches the pardon of sins.

Other teaching peculiar to Paul, is found in his great systematic exposition of the Gospel and in other letters.

In Rom. 1^{1-7}, a somewhat formal greeting, Paul pays very conspicuous honour to Christ as Son of God, marked out as such by resurrection of the dead. In *vv.*$^{8-15}$ personal details follow, including Paul's eagerness to preach at Rome the *Gospel*. This last word introduces an important description of it: "it is a power of God for salvation to everyone that believes." This is further explained in *v.*^{17}; and the explanation is supported by a quotation from Habakkuk: "For a RIGHTEOUSNESS OF GOD is revealed in it, from faith, for faith; as it is written, But the righteous man by faith will live."

In v^{18}, using the word *revealed* as a hinge, Paul turns suddenly round to new topics. The light of the Gospel vanishes from view and instead of it we have the anger of God against sin. This continues till ch. 3^{21}, when we emerge from the dark shadow as suddenly as we entered it. And, emerging from the shadow, we find ourselves where we were before it darkened our path, but with a deep sense now of spiritual need. In ch. 3^{21f}, we have an expanded repetition of the statement already made in ch. 1^{17}: "But now, apart from law, a righteousness of God has been manifested, witness being borne to it by the Law and the Prophets, a righteousness of God through belief of Jesus Christ, for all that believe." This conspicuous repetition suggests irresistibly that these words assert a FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLE of Paul's theology: and this presumption is raised to complete certainty by the argument following, which is a logical and spiritual development of these words.

168. In Rom. 1^{16}, Paul asserts that in the good news announced by Christ the infinite power of God is put forth to rescue all those, Jews or Gentiles, who believe this good news. This statement he explains by saying that in the Gospel is *revealed* a "righteousness of God, from faith, for faith;" and by quoting, as in harmony with it, an ancient prophecy announcing, in view of impending disaster, that "the righteous man by faith will live." He means that, while the Gospel is preached, a *veil* is lifted disclosing a "righteousness of God," that this *unveiling* is derived "from faith" and is designed to lead "to faith;" and that in the Gospel the saving power of God is put forth for all who believe. Similarly, in ch. 3^{21}, after proving that both Jews and Greeks are all under the burden of sin, and that the Law was given to bring all the world speechless and guilty before God, Paul suddenly and triumphantly asserts that

now, by a method independent of the great principle underlying all law yet receiving attestation from the O.T., a righteousness of God through belief of Jesus Christ and designed for all that believe has been manifested, *i.e.* set conspicuously before the eyes of all.

169. In ch. $3^{5, 25, 26}$, "God's righteousness" is evidently an ATTRIBUTE OF GOD, viz. the agreement of His words and actions with the standard laid down for man. This is implied in the question "is God unrighteous?" and in the purpose, "Himself righteous and a justifier, etc." The righteousness of God differs from that of man only as God the Judge who administers impartially His own laws differs from man who must obey them.

But this simple meaning will NOT SATISFY the conditions of chs. 1^{17}, 3^{21f}. For the harmony of God's action with His own law is conspicuous throughout the Old Testament. Nor would a revelation of it make the Gospel a power of God to save: nor, again, would it present any parallel to the prophecy of Habakkuk that "the righteous man will live by faith." Moreover, in no sense is God's attribute of righteousness "manifested apart from law;" or, "through faith of Jesus Christ." These accumulated objections compel us to seek, for the phrase "righteousness of God" in chs. 1^{17}, 3^{21f}, another meaning.

The same phrase meets us again in ch. 10^{3}. In ch. 9^{30}, we read that "Gentiles, the men not pursuing righteousness, have obtained righteousness, even the righteousness which is from faith. But Israel, while pursuing a law of righteousness, has not attained to such law." This, Paul explains by saying that "not knowing the righteousness of God, and seeking to set up their own righteousness, they have not submitted to the righteousness of God." These last words cannot mean the divine attribute of righteousness; but are

evidently a contrast to "their own righteousness" and to "the righteousness which is from law" in v^5. Cp. v^6, "the righteousness which is from faith," an evident contrast to that "from works" and "from law." Cp. 2 Cor. 5^{21}.

The CORRECT EXPOSITION is suggested in Ph. 3^9. Evidently, "not having a righteousness of my own" is in contrast to "seeking to set up my own righteousness." The further description, "that which is from law" reproduces exactly "the righteousness which is from law" in Rom. 10^5. The contrasted phrase, "the righteousness which is from God on condition of faith," is a conspicuous parallel to the ignored "righteousness of God" and to "the righteousness from faith" in ch. $10^{3, 6}$.

Putting these passages together and observing that they all refer conspicuously to a salvation announced by Christ on condition of faith, accepted by Paul but rejected by most of the Jews, we cannot doubt that the phrase before us is equivalent to "the righteousness from faith" in Rom. 10^6, and to "the righteousness from God on condition of faith" in Ph. 3^9. If so, the "righteousness of God" is a righteousness which GOD GIVES: cp. "the peace of God" in Ph. 4^7; also Jno. 14^{27}. It is that conformity with the divinely-erected standard which God requires as a condition of His favour and of the blessings He has promised, and which He gives to all who believe. As such, it is a marked contrast to Paul's "own righteousness," which can only be "from law." It is revealed in the Gospel: for, by announcing a salvation for all who believe, God made known and gave to men a conformity with the divinely-prescribed condition of the favour of God unknown before. This righteousness is "through faith of Christ;" and "for faith," *i.e.* in order that henceforth faith may be man's mental attitude towards God. As independent of previous obedience, it is "apart from law." But Paul

shows that faith as a condition of the favour of God is in harmony with the O.T. And we shall find it to be an instrument used by the "power of God, for salvation, to all that believe."

170. That the above exposition is correct, is proved decisively by the cognate verb JUSTIFY in Rom. $3^{24, 26, 28, 30}$, 4^{5}, introduced without any explanation evidently as an equivalent to the "righteousness of God." It denotes to MAKE-RIGHTEOUS; but always in a forensic or subjective sense. So Rom. 2^{13}, $3^{4, 20}$, Mt. 12^{37}, Jas. 2^{21}, Lk. 7^{29}, 10^{29}, 16^{15}. In the LXX. it is common, often as a technical term for a judge's sentence in a man's favour: so Dt. 25^{1}, Isa. 5^{23}, Prov. 17^{15}, 1 Kgs. 8^{32}, cp. Job. 32^{2}, 33^{32}; meaning always to make righteous, not objectively, but from the judge's point of view. In classical Greek the word denotes to *reckon* or *claim* as a *right*, or to *treat* a person *justly*; but not to make actually righteous. See Aristotle's *Nic. Ethics* bk. v. $9^{2, 3}$.

Paul declares in Rom. $3^{26, 28, 30}$, Gal. 2^{16}, 3^{8} that, apart from works done in obedience to law, God justifies those who believe. The comparative frequency of the word *justify* in N.T. and LXX. compels us, in the absence of any reasons to the contrary, to give it the same meaning here. In other words, Paul taught that they who believe the good news announced by Christ need not wait till the great assize in order to know their destiny, that to them the Judge has already spoken, in their favour; and that this favourable judgment is not obtained by obedience to law but by belief of the words of Christ.

An independent witness that Justification through Faith was an important element of the teaching of Paul is found in Acts 13^{39}: the more remarkable because nowhere else in N.T. do we find the phrase "justified through faith" except in the letters of Paul.

171. Another evidently equivalent phrase, FAITH RECKONED FOR RIGHTEOUSNESS, quoted from Gen. 15^6, is found in Rom. $4^{3, 5, 9, 11, 22, 23, 24}$; along with the forms in ch. $3^{21, 22}$ and in *vv.* $^{26, 28, 30}$. At Mamre Abraham believed the great promise, "So shall be thy seed;" and (Gen. 15^{18}) on that day God made a covenant with him. This covenant implies that he possessed the favour of God: he obtained it by believing the word and promise of God. This unexpected parallel with Paul's teaching that, in Christ, God justifies all who believe is most important. To men who boasted of God's covenant with their father Abraham, Paul proves from the O.T. that this covenant was obtained, not by obedience to law—for no written and definite law had then been given—but by belief of a divine promise. God has now spoken again, has made a New Covenant with man, and receives into His favour all who believe the words of Christ.

The phrase *reckon for righteousness* is evidently forensic, denoting indisputably, not to make actually righteous, but to accept as such. That it is used as equivalent to "justified" and to "righteousness of God," proves decisively that in each of these three phrases Paul taught that God accepts as righteous all who believe the Gospel.

Very interesting as illustrating the meaning of this third phrase are Ps. 106^{31}, a comment on Nm. 25^{10-13}; and 1 Macc. 2^{52} which expounds Gen. 22^{16-18}. God graciously accepted the sacrifice of Isaac and the loyal act of Phineas as righteous actions, to be rewarded.

172. In Rom. 5^1 we read, "Let us then, justified by faith, have PEACE WITH GOD." The phrase "justified in His blood" in *v.*^{9} is replaced in *v.*^{10} by "RECONCILED TO GOD through the death of his Son:" cp. *v.*^{11}. So 2 Cor. 5^{18-20}, Eph. 2^{16}, Col. $1^{20\ 22}$. This fourth equivalent of the phrase

to pardon sins is easily explained. For every king must treat as enemies all who break his laws. Even while earnestly desiring their good, his soldiers must pursue and possibly shoot down those who defy his rule. To such men, pardon means reconciliation and peace. For pardon has restored the normal relation of king and subject. The Gospel announces justification for all who believe it. It is therefore, to those who believe it, a word of pardon: and pardon means peace where before there was ruinous war.

It is now evident, both from their intrinsic meaning and from their mutual relation in the Ep. to Romans, that these five phrases are equivalent, *i.e.* that four of them viz. (1) *righteousness through faith*, (2) *justified by faith*, (3) *faith reckoned for righteousness*, (4) *reconciled to God*, announce in forms peculiar to Paul, (5) *pardon of sins* (Acts 26^{18}) for all who believe.

173. It may be objected that, since a mere imputed righteousness is worse than worthless, the term *righteousness through faith* must include INWARD CONFORMITY to the eternal standard of right. But the equivalent terms *justified*, *reckoned for righteousness*, *pardon*, do not suggest this inward righteousness. Nor does Paul, when discussing justification through faith, suggest it. On the other hand, in his teaching, this doctrine does not stand alone. To the justified, God gives (see § 284) His Holy Spirit to be in them the animating principle of a new moral life. This new life he expounds in chs. 6 and 8. But, when doing so, he forsakes the five phrases noted above and uses other language. So also in Gal. 5^{16}–6^{10}. On the other hand, Paul's constant teaching that the changed relation to God is always accompanied by an inward moral change, probably made it easier for him to use the term *righteousness* for the forensic change. For the consequent inward change prevented the incongruity

of a righteousness not connected with inward conformity with the eternal law of right. In this last sense, the word *righteousness* is used in Rom. $6^{10\text{-}20}$.

174. These five phrases, the fundamental position in the Ep. to Romans of the doctrine they assert, the earnest argument of the Ep. to Galatians, and the specimen of Paul's preaching given in Acts $13^{16\text{-}41}$, prove decisively that this doctrine was an ESSENTIAL AND CONSPICUOUS ELEMENT of the Gospel as he understood it. We have also found, in a memoir of Christ unanimously and confidently attributed in the 2nd cent. to an intimate friend of Christ and bearing every mark of historical truth, in a position analogous to its position in the Ep. to Romans, a doctrine practically equivalent to that of Paul, yet clothed in phraseology and modes of thought quite different from his, viz. eternal life for everyone that believes. This difference of form, along with essential agreement, proves decisively that in these two great theologians of the N.T. we have independent witnesses, of the highest value, about the teaching of Christ. That both of them misunderstood His teaching, is inconceivable.

The above evidence receives strong confirmation from an altogether different source, viz. the tradition embodied in the Synoptic Gospels, which probably represents the teaching of Christ as given to the masses of Israel. Even here, the pardon of sins and faith as the means of blessing, though not so conspicuous as in Paul and John, at once arrest attention.

175. This common element underlying these various types of N.T. thought must have had a common origin: and this can be no other than the ACTUAL TEACHING OF CHRIST. If He taught, as is often recorded in the 4th Gospel, that God gave His Son in order that all who believe in Him may have

eternal life, that they who believe in Him have passed out of death into life and have already eternal life, the teaching of the entire N.T. is explained. For, eternal life for sinners involves forgiveness of their sins. And, since (§ 88) Christ claimed to be the future Judge of the world, His words of pardon are the judge's sentence in the criminal's favour: in other words, through faith even sinners are justified. Thus Paul's entire teaching about justification is a logical development of teaching ascribed to Christ in the 4th Gospel. It therefore confirms the truth of the account there given of the teaching of Christ: for the deep underlying harmony of Paul and John leaves no room for doubt that each of them interpreted correctly His words. And this strong evidence is confirmed by important coincidences in the Synoptic Gospels.

If Christ did not preach the doctrines attributed to Him by Paul and in the 4th Gospel, we are compelled to believe that all the early Christian records were in SERIOUS FUNDAMENTAL ERROR about the teaching of Christ. Yet these men gained for Him the homage of all succeeding ages; and their teaching was the agency through which He turned back (§ 30) from ruin the whole course of human history and saved the world. The impossibility of supposing that these successful teachers were in serious error touching the chief matter of their teaching is decisive proof that the doctrine expounded above was actually taught by Christ. In other words, the only possible explanation of all the facts of the case is that, as matter of fact Jesus of Nazareth taught, under various phrases, that God receives into His favour, in spite of their past sins, all who believe the good news announced by Christ.

Both in Rom. 1^{3f} and Jno. 1^{1-18}, this Gospel of pardon is preceded by an assertion of the superhuman dignity of Christ,

and by a reference to His incarnation: cp. Mt. 1^{20}, Lk. 1^{35}. None but the incarnate Son could have authority to announce the pardon of sins.

CHAPTER XXIII

THE NATURE OF FAITH. FAITH AND WORKS

176. The English word *believe* represents in the O.T. one HEBREW word with practically the same meaning. Its simplest form (Kal) means to carry or support, as a nurse carries and supports an infant: another (Niphal) means to be supported and thus made firm: and the form (Hiphil) rendered *believe* means to make firm, to treat as firm, to lean securely upon. Almost always the word has a PERSONAL-OBJECT or person believed, and usually a definite word believed or OBJECT-MATTER. So Gen. 45^{26}, Ex. $4^{1, 5, 8f, 30f}$, Prov. 14^{15}. In Jud. 11^{20}, Sihon did not believe the promise suggested in *v.*^{19} and recorded in Nm. 21^{22}. In 1 Sam. 27^{12}, Achish's mind was put to rest, touching David's loyalty in the future, by his raid on the south of Judah. To denote a personal object of belief, the Hebrew has two constructions, differing only in one letter, which we may render "give belief *to*" and "put belief *in*:" the latter used only when belief conspicuously involves trust, as in Gen. 15^{6}. This latter form is frequently used with the word *trust*; *e.g.* Ps. 28^{7}, Prov. 31^{11}, 2 Kgs. 18^{5}. Trust differs from belief in that it does not suggest a definite statement or promise believed, but only a general attitude of mind towards the person trusted.

177. The GREEK equivalent of our words *belief* and *faith*,

and of the verb *believe*, is derived from another verb meaning to PERSUADE. In the Greek word the idea of TRUST is more conspicuous than in its English equivalent: so Wisdom 14^{5}, "men *trust* (i.e. *believe*) their lives to a very small timber," *i.e.* to a ship. Same word πιστεύω in Jno. 2^{24}, Lk. 16^{11}, Rom. 3^{2}, 1 Cor. 9^{17}, Tit. 1^{3}, 1 Tim. 1^{11}. In all cases where the word *believe* is used, Greek or Hebrew, we have the same central conception, viz. THE MIND AT REST IN AN IDEA. The voyager is persuaded that the ship will bear him safely, and therefore trusts himself on board; others are persuaded that their goods are safe in another's hand, and therefore commit them to him.

In Acts 27^{25}, we have both the personal-object and the object-matter of belief: "I believe God, that it will be, etc." In classical and biblical Greek, both personal-object and object-matter are put in the DATIVE when following the verb *believe*, as though the speaker and the word spoken were the agent or instrument of the persuasion, as in 2 Th. 2^{11f}, 2 Tim. 1^{12}, Jno. 4^{50}; and in the GENITIVE when following the substantive *belief* or *faith*, as in Rom. 3^{22}, Gal. $2^{16, 20}$. The R.V. rendering "faith in Christ" confounds two different constructions; and should be reserved for the form used in Eph. 1^{15}, 1 Tim. 3^{13}, 2 Tim. 3^{15}; or for that in Rom. 10^{14}, Gal. 2^{16}, Ph. 1^{29}, 1 Pet. 1^{21}, and often in the 4th Gospel. These are reproductions in Greek of the Hebrew phrase *believe in*, noted above as involving trust; but are not found in classical Greek.

178. Why and when does one man's word awaken belief or mental rest in another man? Because in a spoken word the speaker's CHARACTER is involved. Either the word is true, or the speaker is false. If either of these is impossible, the other is certain. Two cases meet us. For testimony about the past, we require only that the speaker understand

that about which he speaks and that he will not deceive us. For a promise, we require also to know that he is able to perform it and will not change his mind. In this case, our belief is an expectation of fulfilment based upon the speaker's known intelligence, veracity, ability, and constancy.

179. In the fundamental doctrine of Rom. 3^{21f}, the new and conspicuous feature is FAITH: righteousness was already familiar to all Jews, but righteousness through faith was a new and startling announcement. This new element is illustrated in Rom. 4^{3}, quoting Gen. 15^{6}, by an all-important comparison with the faith of ABRAHAM. Here we have a definite promise spoken and believed, "So shall be thy seed," the object-matter of Abraham's faith; and its personal object, viz. God who spoke to Abraham these words of promise. Evidently Abraham's belief, which God reckoned to him for righteousness, was an assurance that God's word will come true: cf. Rom. 4^{18}. The troubled mind found rest, even in spite of physical impossibility, in the known ability to perform of Him who had promised: see *v.*^{20f}.

Abraham's faith was RATIONAL: and its reasonableness is capable of logical statement. It was less unlikely that the ordinary course of nature should be set aside than that God should break His word. Intelligent faith is a reasonable interpretation of all the known facts of the case. Thus faith in God, so far from being opposed to reason, is itself attained by a process of legitimate reasoning.

180. In Jas. 2^{19}, we have, compared with that of men, an intelligent and well grounded faith of DEMONS: but it produces in them only terror, because it has no promise of salvation of which it can take hold. On the other hand, in 2 Th. 2^{11}, we have an irrational faith with FALSEHOOD as its object-matter: cp. Prov. 14^{15}.

In Mt. $21^{25, 32}$, $24^{23, 26}$, Mk. 16^{13f}, Acts 8^{12}, 9^{26}, Gen. 45^{26}

Ex. 4^{1}, 1 Sam. 27^{12}, we have faith reposed in, or refused to, men. This implies that faith in God is analogous to the CONFIDENCE of man IN MAN, differing only as God differs from man, and God's words from man's words. But the contents and authority of God's words rise so high above any words spoken by man that they evoke in us a confidence in God far surpassing, in its complete repose and its moral effects, any confidence we can place in man. This unique confidence in God is recognised in our language, which has been formed under Christian influences, by the general reservation of the word *faith* for religious belief, a reservation unknown in Greek. But the mental process is the same; and the one illustrates the other: so Jno. 5^{46f}, 1 Jno. 5^{9}, Ex. 14^{31}, 2 Chr. 20^{20}.

181. Of JUSTIFYING FAITH, the object-matter is the good news that in Christ God receives into His favour all who believe this good news. Since the good news comes from God through the lips of Christ, God speaking to men in Christ is its personal Object. Since the word believed involves a promise which no human or natural authority can fulfil and, as we shall see in §§ 259, 283, a moral change possible only to the infinite power of God, it is, like the faith of Abraham, an expectation of fulfilment resting, with the infinite interests at stake, on the power and faithfulness of God.

If we accept as true this good news, we thereby fulfil the condition on which is suspended this promise of eternal life. Consequently our belief of the abstract statements in Jno. 3^{16}, Rom. 3^{21f} becomes a personal trust that God now receives into His favour us who believe, and now gives us a life which will develop into the blessedness of heaven: and this abstract doctrine becomes, to him who intelligently believes it, the voice of God announcing the pardon of his

sins. We may therefore describe justifying faith as an assurance, resting upon the promise and character of God, that He now receives into His favour as heirs of eternal life, in spite of past sins, us who believe the good news of salvation announced by Christ.

This faith will, in Part VIII., receive absolute verification in the New Life in Christ, received by those who believe: see § 287f.

182. The foregoing account of justifying faith helps to remove an apparent CONTRADICTION between the announcement of pardon for all who believe, in Rom. 1^{16}, 3^{22}, and the judgment of God against sinners in ch. $2^{3ff.}$ Cp. Gal. 2^{16} with 5^{21}; Jno. 3^{16} with 1 Jno. 3^{8}. The emphatic and repeated teaching of the various N.T. writers forbids us to accept as satisfactory any solution which does not maintain in full force each side of this apparent contradiction. Moreover, the majesty of the Moral Law forbids us to believe that God smiles on any who continue in sin: on the other hand, nothing less than full and free pardon will supply the deep need of guilty and helpless humanity.

The harmony we seek is to be found in the OBJECT-MATTER of saving faith, which is, as we have just seen, not a statement about God, but a promise of salvation for all who believe. Now the moral teaching of Christ, echoed by our own moral sense, forbids us to believe that God smiles on those who sin. Consequently it is psychologically impossible to believe God's word of pardon until we are prepared to forsake sin. And, since a sad experience has revealed our utter inability to do this, justifying faith becomes an assurance, not only that God now receives into His favour us who believe the good news of salvation, but also that from the moment we believe He will give us power to conquer sin.

See further in §§ 289–292. It is also evident that we cannot continue to exercise saving faith unless we actually turn from sin. For we cannot believe that God smiles on us while we do that on which He frowns. Thus the moral teaching of Christ, which the law written in our hearts compels us to accept, guards from perversion the Gospel of Christ, by making faith impossible except to those who purpose to forsake sin, and abiding faith impossible except to those who actually conquer it. The moral law compels those who love sin to disbelieve the promise of pardon and thus keeps them outside the number of those for whom the Gospel announces pardon. It closes every gate to forgiveness except that which leads away from sin.

In Rom. 2^{13}, Mt. 12^{37} (cp. Jas. 2^{21}) we find a future justification by WORKS in marked contrast to the present justification apart from works in Rom. 3^{28}, Gal. 2^{16}. These two justifications represent the two lines of teaching just expounded. Throughout the N.T. they are conspicuously interwoven.

183. This turning from sin has given rise to the familiar word CONVERSION: see R.V. Ps. 51^{13}, Acts 15^{3}, Jas. 5^{19f}: same word in Isa. 55^{7}, Jer. $3^{12, 22}$, 4^{1}, 18^{11}, 24^{7}, 35^{15}, $36^{3, 7}$, etc.; Mt. 13^{15}, Acts 3^{19}, 9^{35}, 11^{21}, 14^{15}, 15^{19}, $26^{18, 20}$, 1 Th. 1^{9}, 1 Pet. 2^{25}. In Gal 4^{9} the same word denotes a retrograde turning back to the world.

184. Closely connected with the word just considered and with forgiveness of sins, is the word *μετάνοια*, in R.V. REPENTANCE except Amer. txt. Heb. 12^{17}, denoting etymologically a change of mind. It is frequent in the O.T., nearly always of God, who in 1 Sam. 15^{29}, Jer. 4^{28}, etc., is said to be incapable of repentance; and yet in Jer. $18^{8, 10}$, Jon. $3^{9, 10}$, 4^{2}, Joel $2^{13, 14}$ is said to repent. The apparent contradiction is easily explained. Change of purpose is not divine but

human: for all God's purposes are good. But, in order to assert, in the strongest language possible, that God's treatment of men is conditioned by their own action, Jeremiah represents God as saying that if men turn from sin He will turn from His purpose to punish them.

The same word denotes, in Wisdom 11^{24}, $12^{10, 19}$, Sir. 44^{16}, a MORAL change of mind. In this sense, it is used in Mt. 3^{2}, Mk. 6^{12}, Lk. $13^{3, 5}$, $15^{7, 10}$, Acts 2^{38}, 3^{19}, 17^{30}, Rom. 2^{4}, without further specification as itself conveying an idea sufficiently definite. In Acts 8^{22}, Heb. 6^{1}, Rev. 2^{21f}, 9^{20f}, 16^{11}, we have the sins from which (cp. 2 Cor. 12^{21}) men did or did not mentally turn away. Elsewhere we have the aim of repentance: so Mt. 12^{41}, Lk. 11^{32}, Acts 11^{18}, 20^{21}, 2 Cor. 7^{10}, 2 Tim. 2^{25}. Notice specially Lk. 24^{47}, Acts 5^{31}, 20^{21}, 26^{20}.

Since the word *repent* denotes etymologically a change of mind and this meaning satisfies its use wherever found, whereas the word *convert* denotes merely a turning round towards some definite object, it is best to understand this latter as including the entire change inward and outward which God requires, and the word *repent* as denoting only the inward turning to God. If so, we may define *repentance*, in the N.T., as a sinner's PURPOSE TO FORSAKE SIN AND OBEY GOD.

The above passages assert or imply that repentance is a condition of salvation. And this we have, in § 182, already learnt. It is not another condition in addition to faith: but without repentance there can be no saving faith and therefore no salvation. This explains the important position of repentance, in the passages quoted above, as an essential condition of salvation; and the still more frequent and conspicuous mention of faith as the one condition.

185. In Rom. 2^{4}, Paul blames a supposed objector for

not knowing that GOD is LEADING him towards repentance: yet in spite of this divine leading the man in question has still (*v.*[5]) an impenitent heart. This evidently means, according to Greek idiom, that God is exerting upon him a real influence tending towards repentance; but that, owing to his resistance, this influence is in vain. This general statement and the appeal based upon it imply that upon all men God is exerting this influence. For, if there were an exception, it might be the man to whom Paul speaks. This inference is raised to certainty by God's love to the world (Jno. 3^{16}), which moved Him to give His Son that "the world may be saved." Apart from such divine influence, repentance is impossible: Jno. $6^{44, 65}$. Accordingly, repentance is a work and gift of God: so 2 Tim. 2^{25}, Acts 5^{31}, 11^{18}. But impenitence is altogether a result of man's resistance to divine persuasion. The entire N.T. asserts or assumes, *e.g.* Ph. 1^{6}, 2^{13}, that, from the earliest desire for better things to final victory over the last enemy, salvation is entirely a work and gift of God, a result of divine influences brought to bear in man and on all men; but that the actual effect of these influences depends entirely on man's free surrender to them.

186. We have now learnt that the Founder of Christianity, who, as we proved from decisive documentary evidence, claimed to be a sharer of the infinity and eternity of God, announced forgiveness of sin and eternal life for all who put faith in Him. But we have also learnt that this word of pardon does not silence the voice which in every heart asserts that all who sin are laying up for themselves a retribution of destruction; for we have traced each of these voices to the lips of Christ. Their apparent conflict has taught us that, in order to be permanently effective, pardon must be followed by a new life of obedience. How

this great moral change will come about, we wait to learn.

Meanwhile, other important elements of the case demand our attention, viz. the mysterious death of the Herald of pardon and His resurrection from the dead.

PART VII

THROUGH JESUS CHRIST

CHAPTER XXIV

THE CROSS OF CHRIST

187. HITHERTO we have spoken of Christ merely as announcing the Gospel of Pardon. That this last stands in other and more mysterious relations to Him, will soon appear.

Very conspicuous is the incident recorded in Mt. $16^{13\text{-}28}$, Mk. $8^{27\text{-}38}$, Lk. $9^{18\text{-}27}$. Christ has drawn His disciples far away from the crowded shores of the Lake of Gennesaret in order, amid the solitudes overshadowed by the snows of Hermon, to reveal to them new truths. But before doing this He inquires whether they have learnt the truths already taught. He asks, "Whom do men say that I am?" Peter's ready words express the thoughts of all: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." This satisfactory answer is at once followed by a further revelation: "From that time began Jesus to show to His disciples that He must needs go away to Jerusalem . . . . and be PUT TO DEATH, and the third day be raised." In other words, Christ not only foresees His violent death, but says that necessity compels Him to make a long journey, in order to put Himself in the hands of men who, as He knows, will kill Him. He thus finds it needful to set aside, for Himself, a command given, in Mt. 10^{23}, to His disciples. Similarly, in Mt. 17^{12}, Mk. 9^{12}; Mt. 17^{22f}, Mk. 9^{31}, Lk. 9^{44}; Mt. 20^{18f}, Mk. 10^{33f}, Lk. 18^{31f}. This repetition throws into conspicuous prominence Christ's

approaching DEATH. It is the more remarkable because up to this point we have no indication of hostility so deadly and so powerful as to close up, to a young and popular teacher, all hope of escape.

A deliberate PURPOSE TO DIE is implied, in a startling metaphor in Mt. 20^{28}, Mk. 10^{45}. In Mt. 26^{28}, Mk. 14^{24}, Lk. 22^{20}, 1 Cor. 11^{25}, the young Teacher ordains, in freedom and apparent health, a permanent rite to commemorate the violent death he is about to die. Such a rite, ordained in such circumstances, is unique in history. And, that He deliberately sacrificed a life infinitely the most precious on earth, reveals a purpose, otherwise unattainable, worthy of this great sacrifice. That in Mt. 27^{46}, Mk. 15^{34}, Christ cries out that He was forsaken by God, implies a mystery of agony not shared by others.

188. Not less conspicuous are the references to His death in Jno. 1^{29} (cp. 2^{13}), $6^{51, 53, 54, 55, 56}$, $10^{15, 17}$, 11^{51}, $12^{24, 32}$, 15^{13}. Thus in each of the four Gospels Christ is represented as conspicuously pointing to His own approaching and violent death as in essential relation to the salvation announced by Him. Similarly, in 1 Jno. 1^{7}, 2^{2}, 3^{16}, 4^{10}; 1 Pet. 1^{18f}, 2^{24}, 3^{18}; Rev. 1^{5}, $5^{6, 9}$, 7^{14}.

The above teaching, from various N.T. writers, proves decisively that the early followers of Christ looked back upon His unjust and cruel death on the cross, not with regret or revenge, but with deep gratitude as the costly MEANS of their RESCUE from the penalty and bondage of sin; and as voluntarily undergone by Christ, in harmony with a deliberate purpose of God, for this end. But it does not explain the necessity for this costly means of salvation, nor the relation of the death of Christ to man's sin and salvation. For such explanation, we must look to the teaching of Paul.

189. Teaching practically identical with the above, in

phrase and thought, we find in 1 Cor.[17, 18, 23], 2^2, 5^7, 10^{16}, 11^{25f}, 2 Cor. 5^{15}, Gal. 3^{13}, $6^{12, 14}$, Eph. 1^7, $2^{13, 16}$, Ph. 3^{18}, Col. $1^{20, 22}$, 2^{14}, 1 Tim. 2^6, Tit. 2^{14}: cp. Heb. $2^{9, 10, 14, 17}$, $9^{12, 14, 15, 26, 28}$, $10^{12, 29}$, 13^{12}. Still more important teaching occurs in Rom. 3^{24-26}, where, after announcing a righteousness of God through faith, Paul says that justification comes through *redemption* in Christ, whom God set forth as a *propitiation* in His blood, in order to give proof of God's righteousness, in order that He may be Himself righteous and may nevertheless justify those who put faith in Jesus.

190. The word rendered REDEMPTION, and its cognates, may be studied in Ex. 21^8, Zeph. 3^1, Lxx.; and in Rom. 8^{23}, 1 Cor. 1^{30}, Eph. $1^{7, 14}$, 4^{30}, Col. 1^{14}, Heb. 9^{15}, 11^{35}, Lk. 21^{28}. A cognate and simpler substantive is used in Mt. 20^{28}, Mk. 10^{45}, Prov. 13^8, 6^{35}; the corresponding verb in Ex. 13^{13}, Lv. $25^{25, 30, 33, 48f, 54}$, 27^{13-33}, Nm. 18^{15f}; also in classical Greek for liberation of captives by a price paid; and in a looser sense in Dt. 7^8, 9^{26}, 13^5, 15^{15}, 21^8, 24^{18}, 2 Sam. 4^9, 7^{23}, 1 Chr. 17^{21}, Neh. 1^{10}. In all the above, the idea of rescue is conspicuous; and in these last it obscures that of price, which in the others is equally conspicuous. Usually, to *ransom* or *redeem* is to LIBERATE BY PAYMENT OF A PRICE.

Other words, with wholly different origin but similar meaning, are used in 1 Cor. 6^{20}, 7^{23}, Gal. 3^{13}, 4^5.

In what sense is the word used in Rom. 3^{24}? The idea of escape from the penalty of sin is implied in the foregoing word *justified*: and the word *blood* in *v.*[25] suggests that the death of Christ was the means, and in this sense the price, of this liberation. So in 1 Tim. 2^6, Tit. 2^{14}, Mt. 20^{28}. This exposition relieves us from the difficulty of saying to whom was paid the ransom of our salvation. The phraseology before us is a metaphorical and expressive mode of asserting the costliness (cp. 1 Pet. 1^{18f}) of our liberation and the absolute

necessity of the death of Christ for our salvation. This metaphor is one of the most common in human thought and language. Whatever is obtained with difficulty, with effort or toil or pain, we speak of as *costing* this effort or toil or pain, even when no one receives the price we pay. As used in the N.T., Redemption is the DELIVERANCE OF SINNERS FROM THE CONSEQUENCES OF THEIR SINS BY THE COSTLY, BUT NECESSARY, MEANS OF THE DEATH OF CHRIST. It implies that Christ died IN OUR STEAD: for the ransom takes conspicuously the place of the captives set free; and Christ saved us from death by Himself dying. This substitution is implied in the word ἀντί in Mt. 20^{28}, Mk. 10^{45}, 1 Tim. 2^{6}: see also 2 Cor. 5^{21}, Gal. 3^{13}. No account of the significance of the death of Christ is satisfactory if it fail to account for, and to justify, this conspicuous element of N.T. teaching.

191. In Rom. 3^{25}, Paul explains the redemption in Christ by adding, "whom God set forth to be a PROPITIATION through faith, in His *blood*." A cognate word is found in 1 Jno. 2^{2}, 4^{10}: and another in Heb. 2^{17}. Similarly, Lk. 18^{13}, "become *propitious* to me, the sinner." The word used in these last two passages is very common, as a technical sacrificial term, in the LXX., *e.g.* Lv. $4^{20, 26, 31, 35}$, $5^{6, 10, 13, 18}$, where it is followed by forgiveness of sin: see also Sir. $3^{3, 30}$. This important use of the word is concealed by the R.V. rendering *atonement* in O.T., and in N.T. *propitiation*. In Heb. 9^{5}, the word used in Rom. 3^{25} denotes the *mercy-seat*, as in Ex. 25^{16ff}, etc.

The phrase PROPITIATE GOD, in the sense of deprecating the anger of an offended deity, is common in classical Greek; *e.g.* Homer, *Iliad* bk. i. 147, 386, 444, 472. Here the name of the offended deity is in the accusative, governed directly by the verb *propitiate*. Cp. Gen. 32^{20}, Prov. 16^{14}. But,

except Zech. 7^2, this construction is not used in the Bible in the sense of a sacrifice offered to propitiate God. This grammatical distinction, so remarkably maintained, notes an important difference between the Biblical and pagan conceptions of God. The Greeks looked upon their gods as needing to be appeased, as one man endeavours to turn away the anger of another. But the Sacred Writers knew that God's anger is not a vexation with an individual which needs to be appeased, but an unchangeable opposition to sin. The *propitiation* which the sinner needs is not one which will change God's anger against sin, but one which will SHELTER him FROM THE PUNISHMENT DUE TO his SINS.

192. The above teaching implies clearly that apart from the death of Christ salvation was impossible for man, that only through His death could the fetters of moral bondage be broken and man escape from the anger of God against sin. We now ask, WHEREIN LAY this impossibility, and the need for this costly means of salvation, costly beyond man's farthest and profoundest thought? Before the cross of Christ we stand in silent adoration at the love which moved the Father to give His Son to die for man, and every head is bowed in shame at the guilt which made needful for man's salvation this infinite sacrifice. But our question returns, WHY could NOT the King BY royal PREROGATIVE proclaim forgiveness, put down rebellion by His infinite power, and by the light which dwells in God reveal to the rebels the folly of their resistance and thus lead them back to obedience and peace?

193. For an answer, we turn to the great passage in which Paul states the purpose of the death of Christ, Rom. $3^{24\text{-}26}$. While expounding "the redemption in Christ," he teaches that the aim of the "propitiation in His blood" was to give "proof of God's righteousness," a proof made needful by

His forbearing oversight of sins committed in days gone by; and that its ultimate aim was that God may be "Himself just and a justifier of him that has faith." This aim implies that apart from the death of Christ the pardon of sin would be inconsistent with the JUSTICE OF GOD. This inference cannot be modified by giving to the words "that He may be Himself righteous, etc.," a merely logical sense, viz. that God may be seen to be righteous. For, although the repeated words "for proof of His righteousness" assert conspicuously that a manifestation of His righteousness even while pardoning the guilty was an aim of God in giving Christ to die, the whole sentence implies that this proof was absolutely needful, and that the very attribute of justice, which had been somewhat obscured by God's apparent oversight of sin in days gone by, demanded that in the days of full forgiveness the justice of God should be conspicuously vindicated before the eyes of men. And this necessity is illustrated by human government, in which justice demands not only that right be done, but that it be done conspicuously. Take them as we will, Paul's words imply that God gave Christ to die in order to harmonize with His own justice the justification of believers.

Greek usage forbids us to interpret Rom. 3^{26} as noting merely a RESULT of Christ's death. For a mere result, ὥστε is used; as in ch. 7^{6}, Gal. 2^{13}, Ph. 1^{13}, etc. The phrase here used (εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν κ.τ.λ.) denotes always an intelligent purpose. In v^{25}, εἰς ἔνδειξιν indisputably denotes a purpose: and it is difficult to give to the same preposition another sense here. Moreover, this exposition, if admissible, would not change the practical significance of the sentence. For if, through the death of Christ, that which otherwise would have been unjust and therefore impossible has become just and actual, so remarkable a result could not have come

without a deliberate design of God. In other words, the result reveals DESIGN.

194. As just expounded, Rom. 3^{26} sheds light on *vv.*$^{24, 25}$ and the teaching of the entire N.T. about the death of Christ. For, if by His death the justification of believers is harmonized with the justice of God, it was absolutely needful for man's salvation: for God cannot possibly be unjust. And, if so, His life (see § 190) was the *redemption*-price or *ransom* of our salvation. Moreover, by Himself suffering death, the penalty of sin, Christ offers to God a *propitiation* which (see § 191) shelters the head of the sinner from the punishment due to his sin.

195. Nowhere else in N.T. is the death of Christ placed in express relation to the righteousness of God. But it is placed in conspicuous relation to the LAW. *E.g.* in Rom. 7^{4}, sinners, condemned to separation from Christ who claims our race as His bride, are compared to a married woman forbidden by the law to be united to any other than her still living husband: and the justified, set free by the death of Christ, are compared to a woman set free, by the hand of death, from the law which forbad her second marriage. This comparison, "dead to the Law through the body of Christ," implies that through the death of Christ we have been placed beyond the domain of the Law which condemned us to continued bondage under sin; or, in other words, that through His death has been removed an obstacle to our saving union with Christ having its root in the Law of God; and therefore in His justice. For the Law is the authoritative utterance and embodiment of the justice of God. Same idea in Gal. 2^{19}. Still more clear is Gal. 3^{13f}: and, in pictorial phrase, Col. 2^{14}: cp. Eph. 2^{14}.

These five very different passages reveal the firm hold on the thought of Paul of the idea that through the death of

Christ was removed a hindrance to salvation having its root in the Law of God. And, as we have seen, this implies that, as taught in Rom. 3^{26}, God gave Christ to die in order to harmonize the justification of believers with the justice of God. This we must accept as an important element of his theology. A close coincidence in Heb. 9^{16}, where the writer compares the New *Covenant* (διαθήκη) to a *will* or *testament* which becomes legally valid only by the death of the testator. This comparison implies the legal necessity for the death of Christ as a means of pardon.

196. Another conspicuous element of Paul's teaching, peculiar to him, is that God RECONCILED (§ 172) men to Himself through the death of Christ: so Rom. $5^{1, 10f}$, 2 Cor. 5^{18-20}, Eph. 2^{16}, Col. 1^{20-22}. In all these passages, God is the author and indirect object, men the direct object, and the death of Christ the means, of reconciliation.

This teaching is a just inference from justification through the death of Christ; and as such is introduced in Rom. $5^{1, 9, 10}$. For every king is at war with all who break his laws. In this case, his royal power is put forth to arrest and punish his own subjects. As long as they resist, they have to count on the king as their enemy: and, if transgression is war, forgiveness is peace. For the pardoned criminal is protected by the power of the king.

Again, Paul teaches in Rom. 3^{26} that God gave Christ to die in order to harmonize with His own justice the justification of believers. If so, by the death of Christ is removed an OBSTACLE to justification rooted in the MORAL NATURE of God. This implies that God has something against the sinner which makes needful for his salvation this costly sacrifice. And in the light of this divine hostility to sin, and to the sinner so long as he persists in sin, must be interpreted the assertion, "we were reconciled to God

through the death of His Son." In other words, by Christ's death is removed, not only the sinner's hostility to God, but the sinner's exposure to God's hostility towards all sin. To this hostility of God against sin, the words "reconcile to God" in Rom. 5^{10} seem chiefly to refer. For as yet Paul has said nothing about any inward moral change in the believer. But he has thrown into emphatic prominence the justice of God which made needful propitiation in the blood of Christ.

197. To this exposition it may be OBJECTED that God is never said to be reconciled to the sinner, always the sinner reconciled to God. But in Mt. 5^{24} the words "be reconciled to thy brother" evidently mean to persuade the offended one to lay aside his hostility. Similarly 1 Cor. 7^{11}. In 1 Sam. 29^4, some Philistines feared that David would try to regain the favour of Saul by betraying the men with whom he had taken refuge. Of any enmity of David to Saul, there is no mention or thought. Yet this supposed removal of Saul's anger is described as David being reconciled to him. Similarly Josephus, *Antiq.* bk. v. 2^8, Thucydides bk. ii. 95. This use of the word "reconciled" proves that Paul's language does not imply or suggest that the hindrance to peace removed by means of the death of Christ was wholly or chiefly in man.

On the other hand, see 2 Macc. 1^5, 7^{33}, 8^{29}. But Paul's phraseology is better: for it emphasizes the truth that reconciliation began with God and is His work; and that He is only the indirect object of it, whereas man is its direct object. The real hindrance is man's sin; and this hindrance God removes by the gift of His Son to die. But, as Paul has plainly taught, the reason why this hindrance can be removed only by the death of Christ is to be found in the justice of God. The phraseology

which refuses to make God the direct object of *reconciliation* recalls that which (§ 191) refuses to make Him the direct object of *propitiation*.

This propitiation and reconciliation and the harmonizing of forgiveness with the justice of God are ever attributed to the LOVE OF GOD, who provided, at infinite cost to Himself, the means which His own justice demanded as the only righteous condition of justification. To represent the Father as implacable and as pacified only by the intercession and death of Christ, is to contradict both letter and spirit of Paul's teaching. Indeed, the entire activity of Christ (Jno. 5^{19}) has its real origin in the Father.

198. TO SUM UP. The various N.T. writers agree to teach frequently and conspicuously that (1) the death of Christ is, even as compared with His spotless life and matchless teaching, the means of our salvation; that (2) for this end He deliberately laid down His life; that (3) this costly means of salvation was absolutely needful; and that (4) the need for it lay in man's sin. Paul goes beyond the other N.T. writers in teaching that (5) God gave Christ to die in order to harmonize with His own justice the justification of believers. This further teaching, he confirms by asserting in various ways that through Christ's death we are liberated from the claims and curse of the Law. A similar confirmation is found in a legal metaphor in Heb. 9^{16}. All this implies that the righteousness of God was a hindrance to our forgiveness, a hindrance removed by God through the death of Christ.

The only difference, amid this complete agreement, is that Paul traces the need for this costly means of salvation, not only to man's sin, but to the JUSTICE of God. But this further development is in close accord with the whole thought of Paul, in which the righteousness and law of God occupy

a large place. Moreover, it is a legitimate inference from teaching common to all N.T. writers. For righteousness is that attribute of God which takes special cognizance of sin; and consequently a need created by sin must have its root in the justice of God.

This remarkable agreement proves indisputably that the elements common to the N.T. writers are due to the Great Teacher at whose feet they all sat. In other words, documentary evidence compels us to believe that the Author of the great religious impulse which has saved and is saving the world taught that the pardon of sins proclaimed by Him was to come through His own approaching death, and that for this end He was about voluntarily to die. This we must now accept as well-proved historical fact.

We have already proved (ch. 11) that Christ claimed unique dignity and nearness to God: and in ch. 27 we shall find decisive proof that His body laid dead in the grave returned to life and rose to heaven. This unique victory over death will compel us to accept with lowly homage His stupendous claims and His teaching about the mysterious significance of His own death. These will be assured and all-important results of our theological research. Nor shall we be able to refuse Paul's inference that the need for this costly means of salvation lay in the justice of God.

CHAPTER XXV

THE RATIONALE OF THE ATONEMENT

199. THE foregoing results evoke at once TWO pressing QUESTIONS: (1) Why could not God, apart from the death of Christ, magnanimously pardon sin by royal prerogative, or as a father forgives a penitent child? (2) And, if such pardon by prerogative be forbidden by the justice of God, as Paul's teaching implies, how is the pardon of the guilty reconciled with justice by the death of the Innocent?

200. To the former question, a reply is suggested by the ANALOGY OF CIVIL GOVERNMENT. Practically, a king cannot pardon the guilty. What men call pardon is merely a disguise veiling perplexing incompleteness of evidence, insufficient either for condemnation or acquittal; or a recognition of extenuating circumstances which the sentence could not take into account; or occasionally a bribe to induce accessories to betray the principal offender. This last is never given except with extreme reluctance, and is always felt to be a failure of justice. When guilt is certain and there are no palliations, even the most merciful government is deaf to appeals for mercy, and the sentence is invariably inflicted. In such cases, to pardon the guilty, would evoke a cry of indignation which would shake the firmest throne. Cp. Prov. 17^{15}.

The reason is not far to seek. When the guilty goes free, the INNOCENT SUFFERS. The security of the state demands certain and speedy punishment of all who break its laws: for certainty of punishment is a strong deterrent from crime. To weaken this deterrent, is to invite crime and thus disorganize and break up society. Mercy to an individual is cruelty to the nation. The greatest kindness is a strict administration of justice: for this will deter from crime many who are morally

weak, and thus save them from infinite moral injury; and it will save from their violence those who would be its victims. National welfare demands the maintenance in the highest degree, in the thought of each citizen, of the inevitable sequence of crime and punishment.

This impartial administration of justice always secures respect for a governor: and respect for the governor always strengthens a government and BENEFITS THE STATE. On the other hand, a ruler who fails to inflict punishment is looked down upon with contempt even by those whom he spares: and this contempt weakens both his government and the state. Even in parental rule, it is frequently expedient that a disobedient child, even though penitent, experience the ill result of disobedience. In such cases, parental love prompts and demands punishment: cp. Prov. 13^{24}. Everywhere in human life it is of the utmost importance to maintain the invariable sequence of sin and sorrow, of righteousness and happiness.

201. All this sheds light on God's government of the world. For, just as the principles of right and wrong, so deeply inwoven into human consciousness and underlying all government, are manifestly of superhuman origin and authority, so the absolute necessity of government, for human welfare, proves it to be an ORDINANCE OF GOD: so Rom. 13^{1}. We cannot think of God except as acting upon, and by His action maintaining, those principles of justice which are universal among men. That which in man would be unjust and contemptible, we cannot believe to be consistent with the character of God. We therefore cannot doubt that the principles which underlie good human government underlie also God's government of men.

If the above inference be correct, the justice of God forbad pardon by mere prerogative: and the justice which forbad

it is but one aspect of that love which is the essence of God and which ever seeks the highest welfare of His creatures. All human analogy assures us that the love of God demands maintenance of the invariable sequence of sin and sorrow by an impartial administration of the Law; and therefore forbids the pardon of sin by mere prerogative.

From another point of view, we may say that the creation of free and intelligent agents made needful for their highest good, as a deterrent from sin, the threat of punishment, and that the truth of God made needful its due infliction.

Another reason why God could not pardon sin by mere prerogative is that in Christ He announced, FOR ALL FUTURE TIME, forgiveness, on condition of repentance and faith, for sins not yet committed: cp. 1 Jno. 2^2. Such prospective pardon is inconceivable in human government, and would break down the very foundations of morality. It breaks all analogy between a father's pardon of a penitent child for a sin already committed and the Gospel of pardon announced by Christ. See farther in § 207.

202. A much more difficult question remains. If it be inconsistent with the justice of God to pardon sin by mere prerogative, how is this inconsistency removed or lessened by the DEATH OF THE INNOCENT in order to save the guilty from the due punishment of their sins? No human government would allow such transfer of punishment. This difference between the human administration of justice and the teaching of Paul about the death of Christ demands now our best attention.

Our question is not answered by the conspicuous teaching (see Rom. 5^8, 2 Cor. 5^{15}, 1 Jno. $4^{10, 19}$) that the death of Christ reveals the wonderful LOVE OF GOD to man, and that the love thus revealed changes into love to God the hard heart of man. For this important truth does not

explain Paul's teaching in Rom. 3^{26}, 7^{4}, Gal. 3^{13}, Col. 2^{14} about the relation between Christ's death and the justice and Law of God. Nor does it explain the necessity (Mt. 16^{21}, etc.) which moved Christ to go up to Jerusalem and put Himself in the hands of men who, as He foresaw, would kill Him. Moreover, love never prompts a needless sacrifice, or one needful only to reveal its own intensity or to obtain for its object something which might be had at less cost. Indeed, we sometimes resent, and always regret, useless expenditure on our behalf. On the other hand, when a great benefit, which could not otherwise be ours, or deliverance from great and imminent peril or loss, is obtained for us at great cost, this sacrifice on our behalf, combined with a benefit worthy of the sacrifice, fills us with gratitude. The costliness of the means used to harmonize with the justice of God the justification of sinners, and thus to make it possible, proves clearly that no less costly means would attain the same result. We ask at once, Wherein lay the need for this costly revelation of God's love?

203. In Rom. 3^{26}, Paul asserts that God gave Christ to be a propitiation through faith, in order to afford proof of His righteousness; that He was moved to this by His own apparent tolerance of sin in days gone by; and that the ultimate aim of this proof was to harmonize with His own justice the justification of believers. In other words, the immediate purpose of Christ's death was to manifest the JUSTICE OF GOD in view of past forbearance which seemed to obscure it and in view of the Gospel which announces pardon for all who believe it. The closing words of *v.*^{26} imply that the justice of God itself demanded this manifestation, that it would have been unjust of God to allow His justice to remain obscured and to pardon sin without giving, through the death of Christ, this public proof of His justice.

In harmony with this principle, we notice that in human government justice demands not only impartial administration, but administration manifestly and CONSPICUOUSLY impartial. Whatever obscures or reveals the justice of a ruler hinders or helps the ends of justice. The real question is, Does the death of Christ as a means of man's salvation set in clearer light the justice of God? If so, justice demanded it as a condition of salvation. For justice ever claims, even for the good of the governed, to be openly manifested.

Now justice is the divine attribute underlying the SEQUENCE OF SIN AND SORROW and death. Whatever reveals the inevitability of this sequence reveals God's impartial administration of His own laws. I shall endeavour to show that the death of Christ, following His union with a race smitten with the deadly curse of sin, does reveal this inevitable sequence, and thus reveals God's impartial administration in a way which elicits our profound reverence for the character of God and serves a definite moral purpose.

204. So deeply rooted in our moral nature is our conviction of the sequence of sin and sorrow that we cannot doubt that this sequence was ORDAINED BY THE AUTHOR of our being. Nor can we doubt that it is universal and inevitable. We notice also that frequently, indeed usually, sin brings sorrow not only to the sinner, but to others, often to innocent persons, especially those closely related to the guilty one. The frequency of this result proves it to be a part of the divinely-ordained order of society. And this far-reaching effect of sin reveals, even more than does the suffering of the guilty, the tremendous and deadly power of sin.

The injury wrought by sin upon those associated with the sinner is, in spite of its manifest hardship, a real GAIN TO THE RACE. A world in which none suffered except by their own

fault would be a far less effective school of moral discipline. In view of this gain, we cannot doubt that even this strange connection of sin and innocent suffering was ordained by the wisdom and love of God for the good of mankind.

205. To the human race thus constituted, the Son of Man occupies (see chs. 11, 12) a UNIQUE and very close RELATION as Creator, Lawgiver, and Judge. He called man into existence, wrote in his heart the great principles of morality, linked together moral sequences, and will pronounce and inflict punishment on sin.

At His incarnation, the Son of God entered into a STILL CLOSER RELATION to our race. He took upon Him flesh and blood, and all the conditions of human bodily life, that flesh and blood on which rests (ch. 19), in consequence of man's sin, the doom of death. All this involved, unless the incarnate Son was to be sheltered by special divine intervention from the consequences of His own act, suffering and death. It involved also close contact with man's sin, a contact which could not but be infinitely painful to the pure human spirit of Jesus. In Him, pure human nature experienced to the full, although unstained by its pollution, the painful and shameful consequences of sin. The inevitable result of this union with sinful man was mental and bodily agony followed by death. All this was foreseen and willingly endured by the Son of God.

This INTIMATE UNION of the Creator Son with His creature man was probably part of the original purpose of creation, and needful for its accomplishment and for the highest interests of men. For we can well believe that an intelligent creature can attain his full development and happiness only by closest possible union with his Creator. Had man not sinned, this union would have involved neither death nor suffering. Through man's sin, this union of God with man, needful for

his highest development, involved all that Christ actually suffered.

206. The Son of God BECAME MAN. He thus became conscious, by actual experience, of bodily pain. His pure human spirit felt, as none but the pure can feel, the shame and degradation of sin. The testimony He bore to God's claims on man exposed Him to the fury of bad men. Yet no hand was reached out from heaven to save Him from these various consequences of His entrance into a body doomed to die and into a race dominated by sin. On Him, sin worked out its full consequences until the human body of the Sinless One hung dead on the cross. In other words, the sequence of sin and suffering, ordained by Himself as Creator, was maintained inviolate and ran its full course, although in so doing it struck with infinite agony the Son of God.

If, as suggested above, the close union of the Creator with the creature was needful for man's highest good, the SUFFERINGS OF CHRIST just described were, on account of man's sin, NEEDFUL for the same. In full view of the consequences of so doing, the Son willingly entered into human flesh. And, that God permitted the full consequences of sin to run their course, even though they struck down His only-begotten Son, reveals, in the strongest manner we can conceive, the inevitability of this sequence. In Christ's death we see the essential deadliness of sin and its inevitable result as we could not otherwise have done.

207. This manifestation of the inevitable connection of sin and suffering serves a GREAT MORAL PURPOSE. God's forbearance in not inflicting speedily in former days the full punishment of sin, and His proclamation of pardon for all who believe the good news announced by Christ, might seem to indicate a tolerance of sin, as though it were not essentially evil and deadly. The cross of Christ forbids

the suggestion. That sin slew the Author of life when He came, for our salvation, in some sense under its domain, is the strongest possible warning to avoid all contact with sin.

Thus the death of Christ REVEALS THE JUSTICE OF GOD. By revealing the inevitable sequence of sin and death, a sequence not broken even by the incarnation of the Eternal Son, it reveals the divine attribute underlying that sequence. In the death of Christ, we see the Father not overriding, but submitting to, His own law. We see the strong One submitting to the restraints which for their good He imposed on those under His control. Such submission and self-restraint always secure for a ruler our profound respect. Pardon of sin under such circumstances, and even the prospective announcement of pardon, cannot loosen any moral obligation. For He who proclaims pardon, on definite conditions, maintains at infinite cost to Himself the moral sequences on which rests the highest well-being of men.

This astounding manifestation of the essential deadliness of sin not only safeguards the announcement in Christ of pardon for all who repent and (cp. Rom. 3^{26}) believe, which otherwise would inevitably make easier (see § 200) the path of sin, but becomes itself a powerful DETERRENT FROM SIN. By thus guarding the announcement of pardon from serious immoral abuse, the death of Christ makes possible a promise of forgiveness for sins not yet committed which otherwise would contradict both the justice and the love of God. In the need for this safeguard against immoral misuse, lies the absolute necessity of the death of Christ for the pardon of sins, which underlies the entire New Testament.

208. As an illustration of the subject before us, appeal has often been made to a famous story about ZALEUCUS (Valerius Maximus, bk. 6^5, ext. 3) which tells that, when the lawgiver's son had been found guilty of adultery, a crime

for which the punishment was loss of both eyes, Zaleucus, in order to save his son's sight and yet adhere to the letter of the law, ordered one of his son's eyes to be put out and one of his own. It is true that, by so doing, he evaded inflicting the full intention of the law, which was total blindness. But, whether this story be true or false, it proves conclusively that voluntary endurance of suffering by the innocent may serve the interests of justice as effectively as full punishment inflicted on the guilty. For the mutilated face of Zaleucus would proclaim his inflexible determination to administer impartially his own laws. In view of such self-sacrifice, none would dare to break the law in hope of escape from punishment. In other words, the self-inflicted punishment rendered harmless the partial forgiveness of the crime. Similarly, the death of the Son of God reveals, even more clearly than would the death of all the guilty ones, God's purpose to maintain the sequence of sin and suffering. Moreover, just as this story is a tribute of honour to Zaleucus, so in all ages the servants of Christ have seen in His death a manifestation of the justice of God which has secured their profound homage. And this vindication of God's justice has, in their minds, rendered morally harmless the pardon of sins announced in the Gospel.

209. Sometimes in actual life the SUFFERING of the INNOCENT caused by the sin of others serves a MORAL PURPOSE. For instance, dissolute parents have been roused to a sense of their vileness, and saved, by the suffering they have caused to their children.

An illustration of the good moral effect of refusing to pardon the guilty when the refusal eventually cost the lives of innocent victims occurred some years ago in Greece. A party of Englishmen was captured by brigands at Marathon. The captors offered to release them on condition of a large ransom

and a full pardon. The king was most anxious to save the captives; and was willing, for this end, to pay a large price. But he could not pardon the guilty. For, to permit the robbers to enjoy in peace their ill-gotten gains, would have encouraged other similar acts of violence, and would thus render all life in Greece insecure. Indeed, the discontent which had culminated in the dethronement of the king's predecessor, Otho, had been greatly aggravated by his misplaced mercy in the frequent pardon of criminals and by the insecurity resulting therefrom. The Englishmen were murdered. But the king's refusal to pardon the robbers struck a blow at brigandage in Greece from which it never recovered: and travelling in Greece is now quite safe. In this case, the capture was not foreseen; nor was the death of the innocent voluntary. But the interests of justice and of the nation were helped by the death of innocent men caused by the sin of others: and in this point it is a parallel to the N.T. teaching about the death of Christ.

210. So far, we have looked at Christ's death only as resulting from His entrance into mortal human life. But, for the ends of justice, it was needful that His death should be placed in conspicuous connection with man's sin. This end was attained by His VIOLENT DEATH on the cross. For, indisputably, He died because He was good and had preached righteousness among men who were bad. This all-important connection between His death and our sin would not have been manifested had Christ fled from His enemies and afterwards died a natural death. It was therefore needful, for the manifestation of divine justice and for our salvation, that He should put Himself in the hands of His enemies. And only thus can we interpret Mt. 16^{21}.

211. Whatever estimate may be formed of the above ATTEMPT TO EXPLAIN that which the N.T. writers have left

unexplained, abundant and decisive documentary evidence compels us to believe that Christ taught that He was about to die in order to save men from the due punishment of their sins; and that Paul taught that God gave Christ to die in order to harmonize with His own justice the justification of men, and to give proof of this harmony. We have also observed that Paul's teaching explains fully, and is the only explanation of, the teaching of the rest of the N.T. about the death of Christ. And we have now seen that the analogy of human government affords a strong presumption that God could not pardon sin by mere prerogative; and that the death upon the cross of Him who, in order to enable man to attain his original and glorious destiny, Himself became Man, reveals the inevitable moral sequence of sin and suffering imposed upon man by God for man's good, a revelation made needful by the announcement beforehand of pardon for sins not yet committed. In this real sense, as a means of vindicating the justice of God, apparently obscured by His indulgence in overlooking sin in earlier ages and now forgiving it, the death of Christ was needful for the pardon of sins, and may therefore be spoken of, as it often is in the N.T., as the means of pardon.

This explanation, imperfect as it is, does something to harmonize the N.T. teaching about the death of Christ with other N.T. teaching, with the intuitions of man's moral sense, and with the principles of human government.

212. In Jno. $3^{16, 17}$ Christ asserts conspicuously that the LOVE and the PURPOSE of salvation which moved God to give His Son embraced "the WORLD:" so chs. 6^{51}, 12^{47}; cp. 1^{29}, 1 Jno. 2^{2}, 4^{14}. Similarly 1 Tim. 2^{1-5}, 4^{10}, Tit. 2^{11}; where notice *πάντων ἀνθρώπων*, etc., including conspicuously the whole race. The same universal purpose is asserted in

Ph. $2^{9\text{-}11}$, Col. 1^{20}, Eph. 1^{9}, and in Rom. 5^{18}, where see my *Commentaries*. It is also implied in Rom. 2^{4}, which implies that upon all men, even those who with their impenitent hearts are storing up for themselves punishment in the day of judgment, God is exerting an influence tending towards repentance: see above, § 185. All this implies clearly that Christ died for all men; and that the destruction of the lost is due, not to any limitation in God's purpose of salvation, but simply and only to their own wilful rejection of His mercy.

This universal purpose is NOT LIMITED by Eph. 5^{25}, Acts 20^{28}, Jno. $10^{11.\ 15}$, 11^{52}, 15^{13}, where we read that Christ gave Himself for the Church, etc. For this limited purpose is easily explained by the writer's limited point of view, viz. Christ contemplating the actual result of His own death; and must not be understood as contradicting the universal purpose asserted in the passages quoted above. In His eternal purpose, Christ foresaw its accomplishment in the actual salvation of so many as He foresaw would accept salvation These were therefore, in this special sense, the objects of His purpose. But, inasmuch as God resolved to bring to bear on all men influences which, if yielded to, will lead each one to salvation, both Christ and Paul speak of the purpose as universal.

213. The N.T. never teaches that man's FORESEEN FAITH prompted the gift of Christ: and this is shut out by Rom. 4^{4}, Eph. 2^{8f}, Tit. 3^{5}, which assert that salvation is by grace, not merit. The purpose of salvation was prompted purely by God's pity for ruined man: but, in His purpose to save, God resolved to save, not all men indiscriminately, but only those who should accept salvation. Consequently, salvation is entirely a work and gift of God; but the destruction of the lost is caused only by their own refusal of salvation.

Moreover, Paul has now taught us that, in order to harmonize this purpose with His own justice, God gave Christ to die. If so, Christ died in a special sense for the Church, which He had chosen to be His spotless bride; and in a very real sense, for all mankind.

CHAPTER XXVI

CHRIST IS RISEN

214. IN Mt. 16^{21}, Mk. 8^{31}, Lk. 9^{22}; Mt. 20^{19}, Mk. 10^{34}, Lk. 18^{33}; Mt. 17^{23}, Mk. 9^{31}, Christ is reported to have said, after foretelling His own death, that on the third day or after three days HE WILL RISE FROM THE DEAD: so Mt. 17^{9}, Mk. 9^{9}. Whether or not we accept these words as actually spoken by Him, they prove that those who on the basis of a common tradition drew up these three Gospels believed that shortly after His death the Crucified rose from the dead. Cp. Jno. $2^{19, 22}$, 10^{15-18}.

Each of the Synoptic Gospels reports that, on the morning but one after His death, His grave was found empty by women to whom angels announced, accounting for the empty grave, that Christ had risen. The 4th Gospel describes in graphic detail the empty grave, and Christ's appearance to Mary of Magdala: and this last is confirmed by Mk. 16^{9}, in a very early document possibly not written by the evangelist. The 3rd and 4th Gospels agree to describe an appearance of Christ to the assembled disciples on the evening after His resurrection. In close agreement with 1 Cor. 15^{5}, we have in Lk. 24^{34} an earlier appearance to

Peter. The appearance of Christ to the apostles a week after (Jno. 20^{26}) His first appearance, and the still later appearances in Jno. 21^{1}, Mt. 28^{17}, both in Galilee, agree with the statement in Acts 1^{3} that Christ appeared to His disciples "during forty days." They correct an impression, which might be received from Lk. 24^{50}, that Christ rose to heaven on the day of His resurrection. Thus amid differences of detail, easily accounted for by the excitement and confusion of the moment, the four evangelists agree to say that on Sunday morning the grave of Christ was found empty because the body nailed to the cross had returned to life.

That the words "He is risen" are given to EXPLAIN THE EMPTY grave, implies clearly that the dead body had returned to life: so do Lk. 24^{39}, Jno. 20^{27}. The phrase "raised from the dead" in Jno. 21^{14} recalls the same words in ch. $12^{1, 9, 17}$; and places the resurrection of Christ in line with that of Lazarus, whose body indisputably is represented as coming forth living from the grave.

215. In Acts $1^{1\text{-}11}$ we read that after His death Christ frequently and indisputably showed Himself alive to His disciples, that they saw and conversed with Him during forty days, and that then He was before their eyes taken up to heaven. After this they saw Him no more, except that, in close harmony with Rom. 8^{34}, Col. 3^{1}, Stephen saw Him at the RIGHT HAND OF GOD, and Paul heard His voice from heaven. In Acts 1^{21f}, PETER declares that it was necessary to elect someone, in place of Judas, to be a "witness of His resurrection;" thus indicating his conception of the work of an apostle. Peter's words in ch. $2^{29\text{-}32}$ show clearly that he believed that the body of Christ had been RESCUED FROM the DECAY to which even David's body had fallen a prey, and had come forth living from the grave. In this sense, we must interpret chs. 3^{15}, $4^{2, 10}$, 5^{30}, 10^{40f}. Thus

in each recorded discourse, and in each reply before his judges, Peter asserts that Jesus had risen from the dead.

Similarly Acts $13^{30\text{-}37}$, where PAUL appeals to the testimony of the Galilæans, and like Peter contrasts the resurrection of Christ with the decay of David's corpse. See also chs. $17^{18,\ 31}$, 26^{23}. Notice that in chs. $9^{3\text{-}6}$, $22^{6\text{-}8}$, $26^{13\text{-}18}$, Christ speaks to Paul from heaven. This implies, by its contrast with Jno. $20^{14,\ 19,\ 26}$, 21^{4}, that the body raised from the grave had, as is stated in Acts $1^{9,\ 11}$, been raised from earth to heaven. Evidently this was the confident belief of the writer, as of each of the four evangelists.

216. That it was also the belief of Paul, is proved by the argument in 1 Cor. $15^{12\text{-}17}$. For, a merely spiritual, though real, manifestation of the Crucified as still living in spirit while His body lay rotting in the grave would not in any way have disproved the denial at Corinth of the bodily resurrection described in *vv.*$^{35,\ 44}$. Nor could such spiritual manifestation be described (*vv.*$^{4,\ 20}$) as "being raised from the dead." It would rather be a descent from heaven. Notice also the definite mention of the third day, as in Acts 10^{40}, Lk. 24^{21}, in contrast to various subsequent appearances of Christ, including that to Paul in 1 Cor. 15^{8}. The whole chapter proves both Paul's complete confidence that the dead body of Christ had been raised to life, and the importance of this fact to him as a chief ground of his faith in Christ. The same confidence finds expression in 2 Cor. 4^{14}, 5^{15}; Rom. 1^{4}, 4^{24f}, $6^{4,\ 9}$, 7^{4}, 8^{11}, $10^{7,\ 9}$; Col. 2^{12}, Eph. 1^{19f}, 2^{5}, 1 Th. 1^{10}, 4^{14}, 2 Tim. 2^{8}.

Notice Paul's quiet confidence that Christ was raised from the dead. Without any strong assertion or attempt at proof, he mentions His resurrection as indisputable fact; and frequently uses it as a sure ground of argument. Yet he is ready to adduce, as in 1 Cor. $15^{5\text{-}7}$, credible witnesses for

this everywhere admitted fact. His letters are decisive evidence that without a shadow of doubt and without thought of contradiction he believed that the dead body of Jesus had been brought back to life.

This belief explains at once, and is the only explanation of, Paul's profound and conspicuous REVERENCE FOR CHRIST as infinitely greater than himself and the greatest of men. If, as we have proved from his indisputably genuine letters confirmed by his addresses recorded in an independent historical narrative, he believed that He who in the sight of multitudes hung dead upon the cross had returned to life, we wonder not that in His presence even Paul bowed with humble reverence. And, if he believed that He had come back in triumph from the grave in order to proclaim life for men doomed to die, we wonder not that his lowly homage was raised to rapturous devotion. Whatever truth or error underlay this conviction, it is the only sufficient explanation of Paul's lowly homage for, and absolute confidence in, Christ as divine. Indisputably, his entire thought and work were moulded by his firm belief that the dead body of Christ had returned to life.

A bodily resurrection of Christ implies His ASCENT TO HEAVEN: for, without doubt, when Paul wrote, Christ was no longer living in bodily form on earth. Such ascent is also implied in Rom. 8^{34}, Eph. 1^{20}, 4^{10}, Col. 3^{1}: cp. 1 Th. 1^{10}, Ph. $3^{20f.}$.

The same faith speaks in Heb. 13^{20}; 1^{3}, 7^{26}, 9^{24}, 10^{12}. So 1 Pet. $1^{3, 21}$.

217. Thus the four Gospels, the Bk. of Acts, and the letters of Paul agree to say that Christ rose from the dead on the second morning after His crucifixion; that on that morning His grave was found empty; that He appeared several times to one or more of His disciples, men or women,

in a manner which produced in them complete conviction that His body had returned to life; and that shortly afterwards the body thus raised from the dead was taken up to heaven. Decisive documentary evidence proves that all this was firmly believed by the apostles, that it was soon afterwards believed by multitudes in the city in which He died, that it became the deep conviction of a friend of His murderers, and of His followers throughout the world. In other words, as we trace to its source the great religious impulse which has rescued the world from ruin and turned it into a path of sustained progress, we find it inspired by a serene conviction that Christ had trampled death under foot by returning alive from the grave; and this conviction we have traced to Jerusalem, and to within a few days of His death.

CHAPTER XXVII

PROOF THAT CHRIST ACTUALLY ROSE

218. BEFORE going on to test the truth of the apostles' belief that Christ rose from the dead, we will review the RESULTS already GAINED.

In the visible world around, in the invisible world of our own inner life, and in the social life of men, we found clear indications of an unseen Creator and Ruler, and of retribution beyond the grave. This prospect of retribution awoke in us a consciousness of personal sin and of inward bondage to sin, and a fear of punishment. We cried for pardon and liberation: but our cry found no response in the

material world, in our own moral sense, or in the social life of men. In our perplexity, we noticed the unique superiority of the Christian religion, attested by the unique superiority of the Christian nations; and we traced all this to a unique religious impulse given nearly nineteen centuries ago by a young Syrian artisan. To Him we turned for help.

The moral teaching of Christ, as attested by the earliest Christian documents, we were at once compelled to accept as good in itself and as binding upon us: and the supreme example of Christ claimed the homage of whatever in us is highest and best. We found proof that He spoke often about a loving Father in heaven and about retribution beyond the grave. Thus our own inferences from the phenomena around and within us received remarkable confirmation both from the indisputable moral authority of Christ and from His unique and good influence on mankind.

We found also abundant proof that He announced pardon of sins for all who put faith in Him; and in Part VIII. we shall find proof that He promised to them the Spirit of God to be in them the animating principle of a new life of loyalty to God. This wonderful proclamation would, we felt, supply completely our deep spiritual need, if we ventured, and were justified in venturing, to accept it. But this we could not do until we had decisive proof that it comes from the Supreme Arbiter of human destiny. The moral dignity of Christ and His wonderful influence on the world raised a very strong presumption that He was not in error in a matter bearing so closely on morals as the pardon of sin and a new moral life. But so vast are the issues at stake that we hesitated to accept as decisive the word even of Him who has become in a very real sense the Saviour of the world: and with profound reverence we ask the Galilæan for the authority with

which He dared to break the sequence of sin and death which the Moral Law had bound.

219. With one voice and with complete confidence, the various N.T. writers replied that their Master is INFINITELY GREATER than the greatest of men, and occupies a position of unique dignity and nearness to God. We soon saw that their teaching involves a new conception of God; and we found that in all ages and churches this conception of Christ as divine and this new conception of God have been the cherished and helpful conviction of nearly all those who have done most for the spiritual welfare of men. This homage paid to Christ by those who knew Him personally, by a converted Pharisee and persecutor, and by all subsequent generations of His followers, demands explanation. We ask at once, How came a young man to make on so many others this lasting impression that He was immeasurably greater than the greatest of men? The answer is ready. He won their homage because, with or without design, He produced in them an assured conviction that His body laid dead in the grave had RETURNED TO LIFE. Of this conviction we have, in ch. 26, found complete proof. It accounts abundantly for the reverence and confidence of the early followers of Christ, a confidence which deadly peril could not shake.

We now ask, What is the HISTORIC REALITY which evoked the apostles' confident and indisputable belief that their Master had risen from the dead? Only one alternative is possible. Either (1) the body laid dead in the grave actually returned to life, or (2) His disciples were in error in their belief that it did so. This alternative, we shall best investigate by assuming in turn that the apostles' belief was, and was not, correct; and by tracing each of these assumptions to its logical consequences.

220. If in bodily form Christ actually rose from the dead,

all the FACTS of the case are EXPLAINED. If the grave was found empty as described in each of the four Gospels, if Christ showed Himself to His disciples as we read in Lk. 24^{36}, Jno. 20^{19}, Mk. 16^{14}, and in Jno. 20^{26}, 21^{1}, Mt. 28^{17}, Acts 1^{3}, and gave them satisfactory proof that the body which they saw living before them was that which had been nailed to the cross and laid dead in the grave, if they had seen Him (Acts 1^{9}) rising from earth to heaven, we understand their serene and joyous confidence that their Master had triumphed over death, and was infinitely greater than the greatest of men. We understand now the transformation of the apostles' character to which a comparison of the Gospels and the Bk. of Acts bears abundant witness. We understand also the fearlessness which enabled them to set at defiance, and by their accusation to goad to desperation, the most powerful party in Jerusalem. Men who knew, by proofs appealing irresistibly to their senses, that their Master had trampled under foot the tremendous conqueror before whose dread advance the mightiest on earth tremble and bow, and knew that He had commanded them to rescue from death a race doomed to die and had armed them for the discharge of this commission with His own infinite power, might well be fearless. Thus the fact of the resurrection would explain the courage of the apostles, which otherwise would be inexplicable.

It would also explain their success. For any belief is easily accounted for by the truth of that which is believed. If Christ actually rose, doubtless the evidence that He rose was much more abundant than that which is recorded in the N.T. Doubtless both in public and private the apostles appealed to many proofs which have not come down to us. That multitudes were convinced, is indisputable. If Christ actually rose, their belief is at once explained.

221. The CONVERSION OF PAUL is also explained. For his after life compels us to believe that even in his bitter persecution he was a sincere servant of God. We can well believe that his contact with Christians, even as their enemy, would bring him under the influence of the Gospel and thus help towards his conversion. The clear and honest statements of fact and the straightforward accounts of Christ and His teaching, given by His persecuted followers before their judges might well impress the sincere and intelligent mind of the young Pharisee. Fresh evidence would strengthen day by day his rising doubts. Thus prepared, the vision on the way to Damascus would at last break down all hesitation and bring the proud persecutor as a humble penitent to the feet of Jesus. Further intercourse, after his conversion, with those who had personally known Him would banish all doubt and produce complete conviction that Christ had risen, and that He is the own Son of God. Thus the actual resurrection of Christ would explain the story of Paul.

222. It would also explain the EFFECT of Christianity ON THE WORLD. For, if Christ rose from the dead, He is what He claimed to be, the Eternal Son of God; and His birth was infinitely the most stupendous event in the history of the world. If so, we need not wonder that the Gospel He preached, re-echoed by the apostles, survived and spread, in spite of all opposition; and that wherever it has gone it has been a source of manifold blessing. And we need not wonder that the nations which have received it stand immeasurably in advance of all others. In short, if Christ actually came forth living from the grave and showed Himself to His disciples as narrated in the N.T., the facts of Christianity and the most conspicuous facts of human history are fully explained. Around this central fact, all other arrange themselves.

223. If Christ DID NOT RISE from the dead, we must

suppose either (1) that He did not actually die, or (2) that the apostles were in error in supposing that they had seen alive the body nailed to the cross.

It is most unlikely that one condemned to die at the instigation of the two most powerful parties in Jerusalem would be TAKEN DOWN from the cross BEFORE He was actually DEAD. It is also inconceivable that one who had suffered the agonies of crucifixion and had been laid in the grave as dead would, without help, revive. But who would render the help needful? No friend of Christ. For such help could not possibly have been kept secret from His disciples, and would have destroyed the ground of their confidence. Moreover, if He had survived, He would be in extreme weakness. Is it conceivable that a man slowly recovering from wounds which must have drained almost to the point of death His bodily strength could produce in those who knew Him best a conviction that He had trampled death under foot with a triumph so complete as to reveal superhuman power? Certainly, the reverent confidence in Christ which gave to His followers, who before His death had shown no special courage, their almost superhuman courage could not be evoked by any appearance of an invalid needing most watchful care. Such hypothesis also leaves unexplained the final disappearance of Christ in a manner which led His disciples to believe that He had risen to the right hand of God. It thus fails utterly and ludicrously to explain the facts of the case.

224. The only alternative remaining is to suppose that the APOSTLES were IN ERROR in their belief that they had seen alive the body laid dead in the grave. In this case, the appearances to the disciples existed only in their imagination; or were produced by a supernatural, but only spiritual, influence on their minds.

If the belief of the apostles was a delusion, it would almost certainly have been DETECTED; and it could not account for the indisputable effects of the Gospel.

The likelihood of detection is immensely increased by the strong motive which the most powerful party in Jerusalem had for exposing the delusion spreading in their midst. For, if the bold assertion of the apostles was true, they who had crucified Christ had slain the Hope of Israel. They were guilty of the blood not so much of a man as of a nation. For they had destroyed Him who alone could save the nation from impending ruin. If this were once believed, the lives of the murderers would be in deadly peril. The reality of this danger is seen in Acts $5^{26, 28}$. It would make the enemies of Christ most eager to disprove the delusion rapidly spreading in Jerusalem.

There must have been means of doing so. For the BODY of Christ, if it had not returned to life, must have been SOMEWHERE IN JERUSALEM. It is difficult to disbelieve the testimony of the four Gospels that it was buried with honour in a private grave. And it is in the last degree unlikely that it was taken out of the grave. Enemies would not take it secretly: and the courage of the apostles forbids us to believe that they were guilty of fraud. Even if the corpse of Jesus were cast into a common trench along with the crucified robbers, it is almost certain that the burial place of one so notorious would be known. By opening the grave and uncovering the carefully buried body, or by opening the trench and exposing the remains of three corpses, the powerful party which had slain Jesus would at once and for ever dispel the delusion which was threatening to destroy them.

In any case, if the apostles were in error, there must have been means of disproving their statements: for these would

be contradictory, and the contradictions would disprove them. That a plain statement touching simple matter of fact said to have taken place a few weeks ago in their own city survived, in spite of resolute opposition, is strong evidence of the truth of the assertion which no opposition could silence. The survival and spread of the belief that in bodily form Christ rose from the dead cannot be explained except on the supposition that the belief was true.

225. The CONVERSION of PAUL greatly increases the difficulty of supposing that the Galilæan apostles were in error. For, of his keen intelligence and well-balanced judgment, and of his former hostility to the Gospel, we have (*e.g.* 1 Cor. 15^{9}, Gal. 1^{13f}) abundant proof. His hostility would quickly detect the baselessness of a belief resting only on the imagination of unlettered men and women. That the pupil of Gamaliel accepted the belief of the fishermen as his own deep conviction, proves that he had evidence which convinced him that Christ had risen from the dead and was thus marked out as the hoped-for deliverer of Israel. Evidence sufficient to convince so intelligent and so resolute an opponent demands explanation.

We have no right to infer that Paul's belief that Christ rose from the dead rested on his vision on the way to Damascus. For the evidence which ultimately produces conviction is often only a small part of the evidence on which the conviction rests. From 1 Cor. 15^{5-7} we learn the care with which he had collected evidence that Christ had risen.

226. Nor can the hypothesis before us explain (see ch. 4) the EFFECT of Christianity ON THE WORLD. For this reveals a putting forth of unique and superhuman power. Moreover, as we have seen, the earliest agents of this power believed that their Master came forth living from the grave in which

He lay dead; and this belief was the mainspring of their activity. That activity saved our race from the ruin into which in their day it was rapidly sinking, and gave to human life a new impulse still making itself felt in the progress of the Christian nations in contrast to the stagnation of others. If Christ did not rise, that activity, so mighty for good, was prompted by a delusion. If so, in the greatest crisis of human history, the Spirit of Truth made use of delusion as a means of leading our race out of darkness into light; and a DELUSION, the most intense and wide-spread of all which have led astray the erring mind of man, has SAVED THE WORLD.

227. It has been suggested that in a supernatural but PURELY SPIRITUAL way, while His body lay rotting in the grave, the Risen One manifested Himself to His disciples and thus evoked in them the courage which enabled them to set at defiance the peril involved in proclaiming His Messiahship. We need not deny that, even apart from a bodily resurrection, the Spirit of Jesus could so approach and act upon the spirits of men as to produce in them a firm and well-grounded conviction that He is infinitely greater than the greatest of men. But this supposition will not account for the empty grave, and for the disappearance, beyond identification, of the body of Christ. Moreover, it leaves the apostles in the delusion of believing (see § 215f) that His body had escaped the decay of death.

How far from the thought of the N.T. writers was the idea of a merely spiritual revelation of Christ to His disciples, is seen in the marked distinction between the one definite resurrection of Christ on "the third day" and the various subsequent visions: cp. Jno. 21^{14}, 1 Cor. 15^{4}. Nor will this theory account for the early CESSATION of the APPEARANCES except a few appearances from heaven. This early cessation

of visions so encouraging to the apostles while engaged in their arduous and perilous work demands explanation. It reveals their firm belief that the body raised from the dead, which for a time appeared on earth, had been raised to heaven.

228. Other considerations strengthen the foregoing argument. Practically the belief that Christ is divine (see ch. 11) and the belief that His dead body returned to life STAND or fall TOGETHER. With exceptions too few to mention, all modern writers who deny the bodily resurrection of Christ reject also the N.T. teaching about His superhuman dignity and His relation to God. Modern theological controversy knows only one alternative. Either (1) Christ claimed to be in a unique sense the Son of God and in bodily form rose from the dead or (2) the most distinctive features of the teaching of the apostles are a tissue of errors based on a series of delusions. If He did not rise, we must believe that they who gained for Him the homage of mankind and through whom He became the Saviour of the world were not only in error touching His resurrection, but ascribed to Him claims from which He would have shrunk back with horror as blasphemous; that they held a new and complicated and altogether erroneous conception of God; and that this complicated error has survived to our time as the deep conviction of nearly all who have done most for the spiritual good of mankind. And we must explain the fact that wherever this complicated tissue of error is not known and believed we have helpless stagnation and decay. In short, Christianity itself, historically and theologically, rests on a belief that Christ rose from the dead and is the eternal Son of God. If this belief be not true, modern civilisation and progress are conterminous with a deep and complicated delusion.

From the above, we see that to deny the bodily resurrection

of Christ is to accept an alternative which contradicts all the known sequences of human life and to reduce the history of the past to a complex tissue of impossibilities. So terrible an alternative is unworthy of consideration unless there be objections to the belief of the apostles more serious than those involved in its rejection. What these objections are, we shall next consider

CHAPTER XXVIII

OBJECTIONS

229. THE foregoing argument does not in any way assume the INFALLIBILITY OF THE BIBLE, or even its general truthfulness: see § 51f. For we have tested and used the various N.T. documents as we should any other written memorials of the past. We have found indisputable proof that certain letters were actually written by Paul, in a form practically the same as we now possess. These bear witness to his well-balanced judgment and high moral character. They also prove beyond possibility of doubt that he had evidence which assured him that the body of Jesus laid dead in the grave had returned to life; and that he accepted this belief in middle life, after determined hostility to the faith he afterwards so earnestly preached. In the rest of the N.T. we found complete proof that this belief of Paul was shared by the other early followers of Christ. And I have shown that this unanimous belief can be accounted for only by the truth of that which the apostles so firmly believed. This proof, inasmuch as it is independent of any special authority of the Bible, is not affected by

questions about its authorship or date or truthfulness except so far as these are mentioned in my argument.

230. It is not invalidated by any DISCREPANCIES, apparent or real, even in the NARRATIVES of the resurrection. For our argument rests, not on one infallible statement, but on the substantial agreement of many witnesses. Human testimony affords innumerable examples of discrepancies in detail which cast no doubt on the substantial truthfulness, in all main outlines, of the statements in which they occur. In the case before us, the discrepancies are easily explained by the excitement of the moment and the wonder of those who had seen the empty grave, and believed that they had seen a vision of angels or the Risen Lord Himself. On the other hand, the serene confidence of the apostles, and its effect upon the world, can be explained only by the truth of that which they believed. Moreover, the differences of the narratives reveal their independence.

Amid many differences, we notice important points of AGREEMENT. Each Gospel narrates that on the morning but one after the crucifixion, on the day after the Jewish Sabbath, the grave was found empty by Mary of Magdala and others, apostles or women: and this is confirmed by Acts 10^{40}, 1 Cor. 15^{4}. In Mt. 28^{9}, Mk. 16^{9}, Jno. 20^{16}, we have an appearance the same morning to Mary of Magdala. In Lk. 24^{34} we have an appearance to Peter on the same day followed by one to the apostles together: cp. Jno. 20^{19}, 1 Cor. 15^{5}. This agreement proves that the belief that Christ had risen began at Jerusalem, within three days of His death.

The argument in ch. 27 does not necessarily imply that the 4th Gospel was written by the apostle John. But it is strengthened by the various evidence that, at least indirectly, it came from him; and by the abundant evidence of its historical truth and accuracy.

231. A more serious objection, not to the evidence for the resurrection of Christ, but to its historical possibility, now demands attention.

Not a few thoughtful men refuse to consider evidence that Christ rose from the dead, on the ground that RESURRECTION of a dead man is INCREDIBLE, and therefore incapable of proof. This objection implies that it is much more unlikely that a dead body returned to life than that Christianity with its wonderful effect on our race is a result of a delusion. This last is at best a suggestion of despair, to be tolerated only as a dire necessity. What is the extreme unlikeliness which has compelled its advocates to accept it?

Some say that the return to life of a dead body would contradict the OBSERVED ORDER of the material world, that upon this invariable and recognised order rest all science and philosophy and material progress, and that to admit the possibility of its interruption would cast confusion on the best attested inductions of mankind, and would destroy that confidence in the constancy of nature which underlies all human thought and action. This objection assumes that the resurrection of Christ would be an interruption of the course of nature; and forgets that this last is a mutual interaction of contrary forces, one neutralising another. It also assumes that, since matter began to be, nothing has happened differing essentially from the order observed by men; and that no forces or Power have ever operated on matter except those which reveal themselves in uniform operation day by day in the various phenomena of the material world. For any new force acting on the forces already at work would deflect their operation into a new channel.

232. This last assumption is overturned by the INSUFFICIENCY of the known forces of NATURE and the observed sequences of cause and effect to account for all observed

phenomena. They cannot account even for themselves: see § 5. Their complexity proves that they are not original: and they cannot say whence they came. Nor can they account for motion. For the forces inherent in matter, *e.g.* gravitation and chemical affinity, all tend ultimately to equilibrium and quiescence. Had there been no force or impulse other than these, equilibrium would never have been disturbed. Thus motion itself reveals some primal impulse unlike all else known to us. Still less can natural forces account for the ORIGIN OF LIFE: see § 3. The transition from the lifeless to the living is utterly unlike all observed sequences of nature and utterly inconceivable in its mode; and thus reveals a force or Power altogether unlike, and superior to, the observed forces of nature. By producing life, this Higher Power changed completely the aspect of our planet, gave to it new beauty and interest, and thus created a new era in its history. Thus the wondrous garment of life which now clothes and adorns the once lifeless world reveals a Power immeasurably greater than the forces which manifest themselves day by day in inorganic or organic matter.

233. This new manifestation of this higher Power by no means implies even a moment's SUSPENSION of the forces already operating. Before life began, the forces of gravitation, heat, chemical affinity, etc., were doubtless operating according to the laws since observed by men. Evidently, in the midst of these forces a new vital force began to work, drawing together already existing chemical atoms into new combinations, arranging these complex molecules into cells, and endowing these cells with the functions of life; and thus in some measure neutralising, or modifying the action of, the earlier and simpler forces at work in inorganic matter, and producing phenomena altogether new. But the earlier forces continued to operate, and modified and limited the

development of the newly-formed living bodies. These last are controlled, for example, by gravitation. Yet this force is, in turn, counteracted whenever we catch a falling ball: but the effect upon our hands and arms tells that the force of gravitation still operates. Similarly, our bodies are affected by the presence or absence of heat and light: and life itself depends on chemical affinities. Yet the vital force within us neutralises chemical forces which otherwise would dissolve, and after death will dissolve, our bodies. In other words, in the origin of life we have no suspension, even for a moment, of the forces already at work in inorganic matter; but we have a new manifestation, among these pre-existing and still operating forces, of a higher Power, producing phenomena altogether unlike all previous phenomena. See § 340.

We notice that the new force, although quite different from those already operating in inorganic matter, works in complete harmony with them; and gives to them and to inorganic matter, as a necessary basis of this new development, a significance without which they would be meaningless and worthless. This harmony reveals the common origin of the lifeless and the living.

234. In the history of our planet, we can trace the advent of another force much later than motion or life, and like them creating a new era. The varieties of living forms have been, apparently, in great part or altogether developed, by the operation of constant forces, from simpler forms. But, between the instincts of the highest brutes and the MORAL SENSE and capacity for improvement OF even the lowest MEN, is a broad line which no influence known to be at work in animals can pass. In man are faculties which cannot be accounted for by the influence of environment or by survival of the fittest. Moreover, history does not favour the suggestion that the earliest races of men were the lowest. We have no

example of a savage tribe rising, unaided, into civilisation. If this happened in the early morning of our race, we have an event then quite unlike everything observed since the memory of man.

Possibly the dawn of reason was gradual. In any case, human reason reveals the operation of a Power higher than the influences already at work in animal life; a Power itself intelligent and moral. Yet, as before, the advent of the new force did not suspend for a moment the operation of already existing forces. Reasoning man is subject to the laws of animal life, even while living a life infinitely higher than that of animals. Yet, as before, it created a new era. And this era gave to vegetable and animal life, as stepping stones to this higher life, new worth and meaning.

235. All this is not inconsistent with the inference that the BODIES of men were DEVELOPED FROM those of ANIMALS. For, just as, before the dawn of life, the chemical elements, out of which was woven the mysterious garb of life, existed in simpler forms, so the new breath of reasoning life may have been breathed, not into inorganic matter, but into already existing animal forms. At the origin of life, the new vital impulse must have built up existing elements into new chemical combinations: and so probably the inbreathed higher life of man developed for itself a suitable visible form.

We have now found clear indications of THREE distinct IMPULSES, those creating motion, life, human reason, each revealing a new force and creating a new era, and giving a new meaning to all that preceded it. The rarity of these new eras warns us not to accept without most careful scrutiny phenomena apparently new as evidence of the advent of a new force. In each of these eras, we have found a large group of well-attested phenomena differing in kind from all observed results of known forces.

236. Similarly, around JESUS of Nazareth are grouped well-attested phenomena differing as widely from all previous phenomena as do those which surround the origin of motion, of life, and of reason. These new phenomena reveal the advent of a new influence into human life.

When Christ was born, the nations of the world were rapidly gravitating into ruin. In the Roman empire, under the guise of imperial might there was everywhere corruption and exhaustion. The Greek race was living, amid the ruins of the past, upon the memories of the past. Over the peoples of the East, already reigned stagnation and decay: and the wild tribes of the North had not yet emerged from barbarism. Throughout the world, overcast by gloom, was scarcely a ray of hope.

Silently and imperceptibly an unseen Hand began to work. There was no suspension of the moral and social forces which seemed to be overturning the foundations of society: but in the midst of the ruin germs of new life appeared, and began to grow. At first it seemed as though they would be crushed by the tremendous forces of evil around. But the new life survived: and gradually Christianity overspread and changed the Roman empire. To-day we have everywhere around us sustained progress. And, more wonderful still, that progress is, and for long centuries has been, found only (see § 22*f*) in those nations which bow to the Prophet of Nazareth. This wonderful change in the condition and prospects of our race involved no suspension of the moral forces which once seemed to be hurrying it to destruction: but it reveals a new force mightier than the forces of evil then reigning with almost undisputed sway. And, that this wonderful change is found only in the Christian nations, proves that this newly manifested moral Power has its source in Jesus.

237. That this new moral force modified directly the

operation of the forces at work in the MATERIAL WORLD, need not surprise us. For the moral and material are so closely related that whatever affects the one affects also the other. Through the wickedness of bad men, the body of Christ was prematurely laid in the grave; and thus apparently given up to the corruption which, in consequence of the chemical affinities of their constituents, claims as its prey the bodies of all the dead. We need not wonder that, in the body of Him through whom was arrested the moral corruption which threatened to destroy the human race, was arrested also the material corruption which in all others follows death, that even the hand of death was compelled to release its prey, and that the Dead One came forth living from the grave. Such arrest of corruption by no means implies suspension of the chemical forces which, in all the dead, reduce into simpler compounds the very complex compounds which compose living bodies. It implies only that in the body of Jesus had lived a life higher than our bodily life; that, just as in all living bodies the hand of life holds back certain chemical forces which otherwise would soon dissolve them, so this higher life either held back, in the dead body of Christ, the progress of bodily corruption, or rolled back a corruption already begun; and breathed life into that lifeless form. Certainly, the Power which at first built up the simple chemical combinations of inorganic matter into the complex carbon compounds, and gave to lifeless matter the forms and functions of life, could raise out of the decaying body of the Crucified the living body of the Risen One. THE ORIGIN OF LIFE IS AS MUCH, AND AS LITTLE, A MIRACLE AS IS THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST. For each event differs in kind from all earlier phenomena; is incapable of explanation by the known forces previously at work; and thus reveals a Power higher than these earlier forces.

238. Each of these events was followed by NEW PHENOMENA which have CONTINUED to our day; and are abiding witnesses of the impulses which gave them birth. All around us is life: but the development of the living out of the lifeless has never been observed by man. Similarly, the moral impulse given by Jesus is attested by the progress which has replaced the hopeless corruption of His day; and by its limitation to the Christian nations. But the impulse itself stands alone as the great turning point of human history. And the peculiar mode in which this new moral force manifested itself in the material world, viz. the return to life of a dead body, is no longer seen. The resurrection of Christ was needful in order to attest the new revelation which He announced, and which apart from such attestation would have been powerless to save. But the repetition of the attestation is needless: for the historical evidence that Christ rose is abundantly confirmed by the manifest effect of Christianity on the world.

It is now evident that the resurrection of Christ is NO ISOLATED EVENT standing alone, contradicting and contradicted by the well-attested uniformity of nature. It stands in line with the greatest events in the history of our planet, the origins of motion, life, and reason; each of which differs as much from all observed phenomena as does the resurrection of Christ. In chs. 57, 59, we shall find reason to expect another new manifestation of supernatural power bringing in another era, a consummation of all preceding eras, viz. the return of Christ to raise the dead and to set up an eternal kingdom. This hope rests on our assurance that Christ has risen. Only through His empty grave can we look forward to a new Earth and Heaven. Moreover, all analogy assures us that any further development will be in harmony with the order already observed, a development of that which is noblest in the present creation: that the future will be

brighter than the past, and that its brightness will be for the righteous.

239. We have now considered the most serious objections to the abundant and conspicuous N.T. teaching that Christ rose from the dead. As we examined them, they altogether vanished: and we have nothing to set against the overwhelming evidence which attests that Jesus claimed to be in a unique sense the Son of God, and that in proof of this claim God raised Him from the dead. Some have thought that this claim is contradicted by the uniform teaching of the book of Nature; and, in deference to their reading of it, have dared to contradict the firm belief of those who gained for their Master the homage of all succeeding ages. We have seen that their daring contradiction is needless; that, though Nature has nothing definite to say about the Gospel of Christ, it has nothing against it. Certainly nothing in the material world compels us to reject the abundant evidence on which rests the Christian hope, and to believe that a delusion has rescued our race from ruin and led it into a new path which for a thousand years has been one of sustained progress.

240. We have now found DECISIVE PROOF that the body of Jesus laid dead in the grave returned to life; and that He claimed to be, in a unique sense, the Son of God, in a sense involving a new conception of God. This claim and this conception of God, we may now accept as just and true: for we cannot for a moment believe that the Conqueror of Death and the Light of the world misunderstood His own dignity and His relation to God. We are therefore compelled by irresistible evidence to recognise the Carpenter of Nazareth as the Architect of the Universe, the coming Judge of all men, and the eternal Companion of God. We have also

found decisive documentary evidence that Christ announced that God receives into His favour and will hereafter receive into eternal life, in spite of their past sins, all who believe these glad tidings of forgiveness; and that in order to gain for us this forgiveness He was about to submit to a cruel death. Thus through the cross and the empty grave of Christ there shines upon us the smile of a pardoning God and the light of immortal life.

These definite and important results will be a sure basis for further research. Especially we ask how we, stained with sin, even though forgiven, can enjoy the favour of Him who claims from all His creatures unreserved devotion, and enter into the spotless glory of His nearer presence.

PART VIII

THE NEW LIFE IN CHRIST

CHAPTER XXIX

ADOPTION

241. In § 151 we saw that the sinner needs a double salvation, (1) pardon for past sins and restoration to the favour of God, and (2) rescue from inward and inherited moral bondage, *i.e.* from the mighty hostile powers which force him, unless rescued by a still mightier Power, along a path of sin and ruin.

We have now found complete proof that Christ announced, for all who put faith in Him, full pardon for all past sins. This pardon is a pledge that all else needed will follow. Already we have been, at infinite cost, reconciled to God. This cost reveals the infinite earnestness of God's purpose to save and bless us; and thus assures us that God will do whatever is needful to complete the good work already begun. For otherwise the price paid for the work already done will be wasted. We therefore look forward, even amid the hardships of life, with exultant joy to the glory which God has promised. This hope and joy are immediate results of justification through faith and through the death of Christ: see argument in Rom. $5^{1\text{-}11}$.

We come now to consider the INWARD DELIVERANCE AND TRANSFORMATION needful before we can enter that glory.

242. In Mt. 5^{9}, in His great inaugural, Christ describes the blessedness of "the peace-makers" by saying that "they

shall be called SONS OF GOD:" a remarkable fulfilment of Hos. 1^{10}, quoted in Rom. 9^{26}. So Mt. 5^{45}, "in order that ye may become sons of your Father in the heavens:" cp. ch. $7^{9\text{-}11}$, where the love of a human father is appealed to as an assurance that God will answer prayer; and Lk. 20^{36}, where the risen ones are called "sons of God." Equally conspicuous are "the *children* of God" in Jno. 1^{12}, 11^{52}; 1 Jno. $3^{1, 2, 10}$, 5^{2}; also Rom. $8^{14, 16, 17, 19, 21}$, $9^{8, 26}$, 2 Cor. 6^{18}, Gal. 3^{26}, 4^{6}, Ph. 2^{15}.

Thus Paul and John agree to teach that they who believe the Gospel thereby become *sons* and *children of God*: and in Mt. and Lk. similar teaching is attributed to Christ.

243. In Gal. 4^{5}, Rom. 8^{15}, Eph. 1^{5}, we have a Greek equivalent to the Latin word *adoptio*, the ordinary term for a Roman legal process by which one man took another's son to be his own son. This process sundered, with certain limitations, all legal relations between the adopted son and his natural father, and created a new relation which in the eye of the law was, with the above limitations, the same as that of a born son to his own father, whose name and rank he took and whose heir he became. The word *adoption* suggests a change as great as when a child of a poor man or of a slave was received into a rich man's family to be henceforth his son. How vast the significance of a legal process about which possibly the adopted one knew nothing! There await him now, not the hardship and degradation of slavery, but wealth and luxury. By using this term, Paul teaches that we who were once slaves of sin have been received into the family of God as His sons.

The same word is in Rom. 8^{23} an equivalent to "the redemption of the body," *i.e.* its rescue from the grave. This reminds us that the formal reception of the adopted sons is still future. Even the material world is waiting for "the

unveiling of the sons of God:" *v.*[19]. On the resurrection morning they will be welcomed to the home of their Father in heaven and into "the glory of the children of God." The word is used again in ch. 9[4] to describe Israel's peculiar relation to God asserted in Ex. 4[22], "Israel is My firstborn *son*." This one nation, God placed in special filial relation to Himself.

The use of this Roman legal term, by Paul only, a Roman citizen, is a remarkable coincidence with the use by him only of the legal term *justify* to describe the pardon of sins; and with the teaching by him only that the death of Christ stands in special relation to the justice and Law of God. So familiar to Paul's thought was the idea of law that even the Gospel assumes with him a legal dress.

244. In close harmony with the above, the adopted sons are, in Gal. 3[29], 4[7], Rom. 8[17], called HEIRS. This implies that we are sharers with Christ, not only in His relation to God as Son, but also in the infinite blessings derived therefrom. Same idea in the cognate word *inheritance* in Eph. 1[14, 18], 5[5], Col. 3[24]. Notice also Tit. 3[7], Acts 20[32].

Teaching similar to the above in thought and phrase is found in Heb. 2[10-12], 12[7f]; 1[14], 6[17], 9[15], 11[7f]; and in 1 Pet. 1[4], Jas. 2[5]. It recalls the blessings of the Old Covenant which passed down from Abraham to his descendants, so Gen. 15[3, 4, 8]; Dt. 4[1, 5, 14, 22, 26, 38, 47], etc.

Thus the various N.T. writers assert, in somewhat different forms, that they who believe the Gospel are not only accepted by God as righteous, in spite of their past sins, but are received into His family as sons, and as sharing or some day to share with the Eternal Son, in virtue of their new relation to God, all the wealth of God. As a conspicuous element common to several types of N.T. teaching, we may accept this with perfect confidence as actually taught by Christ.

245. In all the above passages, we have, not a sonship based on original derivation from God, but a NEW RELATION ACQUIRED by personal faith. But in Acts 17^{28} Paul quotes with approval a poet who claims, for men as such, divine origin: "His *offspring* we are." In a comment on this quotation, he uses the same word *offspring*, instead of his own familiar phrases, *sons* or *children of God*. Taken in connection with the teaching quoted above, this reminds us that Paul never speaks of all men indiscriminately as *sons of God*, but habitually uses language excluding this idea.

A solitary and beautiful EXCEPTION, in the N.T., to this usage is found in Lk. $15^{11, 24}$, where a returning prodigal is recognised as a *son*. This parable presents what we at once feel to be another real side of the sinner's relation to God. Among all visible creatures, man holds a unique place as an offspring of God sharing His intelligent and moral nature: so Gen. 1^{26-28}, 2^{7}. And the Bible bears abundant witness that the whole race, thus closely related to God, is an object of His tender paternal love. In this correct sense, even beyond the influence of the historical revelations recorded in the Bible, men have looked up to the Creator of the universe as the loving Father of all men.

To this conception, we have an easy and remarkable transition in Mt. 5^{45}; also *v.*^{16}, $6^{1, 4, 6, 9, 14, 15, 18, 26, 32}$, 7^{11}, 10^{29}, Mk. 11^{25}, Lk. 6^{36}, 11^{13}, $12^{30, 32}$. But these passages do not imply definitely that God is Father of all men: for Christ is speaking to His disciples. Yet, when we remember that all men spring from God and share His nature as the lower animals do not, and are objects of His special love, it is easy to extend to all men the privilege of saying "Our Father in heaven." But this language does nothing to weaken the reservation by Paul and John of the terms *sons* and *children of God* to those who believe in Christ.

246. This reservation, obscuring, as at first sight it does, the universal fatherhood of God, demands explanation. This is to be found in the truth that by sin all men had LOST THE RIGHTS OF SONSHIP involved in their original derivation from God. Just so, a king's son might lose by rebellion his right of inheritance and be treated as an ordinary rebel. The completeness of this loss could not be more forcefully expressed than it is by the language which describes the sinner's return as *adoption* into the family of God. To that family, he now comes as an alien, and is received into it, not by right of birth, but by a familiar legal process by which even a child of a slave might become a member of his master's family. We cannot doubt that it was in order to put in clearest light the utter loss by sin of man's original privileges as a son of God that Paul and John ignored that original relationship and used the language quoted above.

247. We now see that EVANGELICAL ADOPTION differs from Roman adoption in that it is a restoration to an original relation. This gives to the newly acquired relation its real worth. Roman adoption was only a legal fiction. But when we call God "our Father," this is no fiction, but profound truth. For, originally, in a sense deeper than any mere human relationship, we sprang from God. As derived from Him, sharing His nature, yet personally distinct from Him, we are His children. All that adoption has done is to restore a relation broken by sin.

248. Adoption is by FAITH, for all that believe : so Gal. 3^{26f}, Jno. 1^{12}; cp. 1 Jno. 5^{1}. Consequently, since each is obtained by faith, justification and adoption go together. But they are distinct objects of thought and faith. By the one, we pass from under the condemnation of God : by the other, we enter His family.

249. The above teaching is of utmost practical importance.

Thousands to-day, amid the cares and disappointments of life, look back with vain regret to the bygone days of childhood with its freedom from care and its bright hopes. These joys of childhood, but in richer measure, the above teaching gives us back again. For the children have all the JOYS of CHILDHOOD. The fathers in whom they once trusted lie dead in the grave. Yet they are not orphans. For they live in the presence of a Father infinitely better able to help them than the father they have lost; and in Him they find refuge from every storm and a solace in every sorrow. The day-dreams of their childhood have been dispelled by the rude actualities of mature life. But the roughness of their journey is cheered, and its darkest steps are brightened, by the prospect of an eternal manhood in which the loftiest hopes ever cherished will be surpassed by an infinite and glorious realisation. The prospect of that inheritance has given to them eternal youth.

As yet, however, we have found NO actual INWARD CHANGE no rescue from the power and bondage of sin. But, of this deliverance, both justification and adoption are sure pledges. For, without loyalty and love, sonship is an empty name. Moreover, the infinite cost involved in the mission of the eternal Son to save His lost brethren assures us that God will do all that is needful to make their adoption into His family a glorious and complete reality.

250. In Gal. 4^{5f}, after saying that "God sent forth His Son . . . in order that we may obtain the adoption," or "son-making," Paul adds that, "because" in his readers this purpose is attained and they already "are sons, God sent forth THE SPIRIT of His Son into" their "hearts crying Abba, Father." From this he infers that they are sons and heirs. In chs. 5^{16}-6^{8}, he adds further that the Spirit thus received

is a guiding principle, freeing them from the rule of law, a fruitful seed of every virtue and of a harvest to be reaped in life eternal. Teaching very similar, in Rom. $8^{1\text{-}17}$. The close connection of thought implies that throughout these passages, except where otherwise defined as in Rom. $8^{10,\ 16}$, the word *Spirit* denotes the Holy Spirit of God. Throughout Paul's letters, *e.g.* 2 Cor. 1^{22}, Eph. 1^{13f}, 4^{30}, the gift of the Spirit is a conspicuous element of the new life which Paul assumes that his readers possess.

The Baptist announced that Christ will baptize with the Holy Spirit: Mt. 3^{11}, Mk. 1^{8}, Lk. 3^{16}. In Lk. 11^{13}, Christ promises that God will give the Holy Spirit to those who ask Him; and, in Mt. 10^{20}, that, when His disciples are brought before judges, the Spirit of their Father will speak in them. In Jno. 7^{39} we read that they who have put faith in Christ will receive the Spirit: and, in chs. $14^{16,\ 17,\ 26}$, 15^{26}, 16^{13f}, Christ promises conspicuously, on the night of His betrayal, to give to His disciples "another Helper, the Spirit of the Truth," who will teach them all things, bring to their memory the words of Christ, guide them in or into all the truth, and abide with them for ever. All this leaves no room for doubt that Christ taught that, to those who put faith in Him, He will give the Holy Spirit to be in them the animating principle, the guide, and the strength of a new life. This we may accept as an assured result of our examination of the Christian records: see also § 114. The full significance of this gift, we shall see in § 284.

251. Notice here another difference between Evangelical and Roman Adoption. The latter was only formal: for the nature of the adopted son was in no wise derived from his adopting father. But He who at first breathed into man a measure of His own rational and moral life, and who in Christ adopted some who by their sin had lost all rights

of sonship, can and does breathe into His adopted sons the breath of a new and divine life, even the Spirit of the Son of God. Thus evangelical adoption, which in itself is only a relative change, is immediately followed by, and inseparably connected with, the inspiration of a new life, the life of the Eternal Son.

CHAPTER XXX

ASSURANCE OF SALVATION

252. THROUGHOUT his letters Paul assumes that his readers KNOW that they are JUSTIFIED. In Rom. 5^{2} he asserts that they have been brought into God's favour and stand therein, and are looking forward with joy to future glory: and in *vv.*$^{9\text{-}11}$ he bases an argument on the fact that they have been justified and reconciled and now exult in God. They have experienced a total change in life: chs. $6^{17\text{-}23}$, $7^{5\text{f}}$. The Spirit bears witness, along with their own spirit, that they are children of God; and, already saved, they look forward to a glory compared with which their present afflictions are of no account: ch. $8^{16\text{-}24}$. Although many of them are Gentiles, yet by faith they have obtained righteousness and have been grafted into the good olive tree: chs. 9^{30}, $11^{17\text{-}20}$. The Holy Spirit given to them has made them conscious of God's love, and taught them to call Him *Father*: chs. 5^{5}, 8^{15}.

The Galatian Christians were, amid many imperfections, sons and heirs of God through faith, the Spirit of the Son crying in their hearts "Father:" Gal. 3^{26}, 4^{6}. The immature

Corinthians were babes in Christ, needing food; and therefore alive in Him: 1 Cor. 3^{1-3}. They were God's Temple, in whom dwells His Spirit: ch. 3^{16f}, 6^{19}, 2 Cor. 6^{16}. The Ephesians had forgiveness of their trespasses, had been saved through faith and made alive, brought near to God, and built into the rising walls of the living temple: Eph. 1^{7}, $2^{5.\ 8.\ 13.\ 20}$. When they believed, they were sealed with the Holy Spirit, a pledge of blessings to come: chs. 1^{13}, 4^{30}. In his many prayers, Paul never asks that his readers' sins may be forgiven, nor does he hold out to them a promise of forgiveness. Throughout all his letters, he assumes that they are already forgiven and that they know it, and that they have real, though perhaps very imperfect, spiritual life. Contrast Acts 13^{38}, 26^{18}, 2^{38}; where salvation is offered to the unsaved.

Similarly, in 1 Jno. 2^{12}, even the "children" in the family of God are forgiven. The readers are children of God, in a sense distinguishing them from others: ch. $3^{2.\ 10}$. They know that they have passed out of death into life, that they are of God, and that they abide in Christ, because God has given them the Spirit: chs. 3^{14}, 5^{19}, 3^{24}, 4^{13}: cp. 5^{13}. Similarly 1 Pet. 1^{3-8}.

The above teaching suggests that CONSCIOUS FORGIVENESS was an ordinary experience in the apostolic churches: it certainly implies that it is a blessing designed by God for every member of the Church.

253. How was this assurance OBTAINED? Since it is assumed in Rom. 5^{2-11}, we must seek an answer in the foregoing chapters. We shall find it in Paul's doctrine that all who BELIEVE are thereby justified: Rom. $3^{28.\ 30}$, Gal. 2^{16}, Acts 13^{38f}. For, as we saw in § 181, justifying faith is an assurance, resting upon the promise and power and faithfulness of God, that He receives into His favour, in spite of their

past sins, all who put faith in Christ. Now assurance is matter of immediate consciousness. If we are sure of anything, we KNOW that we are SURE of it. Consequently, if God receives all who believe, we know that He receives us: and the promise of pardon for all that believe becomes, to each individual, a divine announcement of his own forgiveness. Thus our assurance of pardon is derived from, and rests upon, the promise and character of God, a promise which we have traced by strictly historical evidence to the lips of Him who claimed to be the Son of God and who in proof of this claim was raised from the dead.

This firm ground of faith and hope is greatly STRENGTHENED by the manifestation, in the death of His Son, of God's infinite LOVE to man. This confirmation of our faith and hope is rational, and capable of rational statement. Accordingly, in order to confirm the exultant hope expressed in Rom. 5^2, Paul proves in *vv.* $^{5\text{-}8}$ how great is God's love to men. In other words, the assurance of forgiveness assumed by Paul rests upon the love of God manifested in the death of Him who by resurrection from the dead made good His claim to be the Son of God, this love being apprehended by correct human reasoning. It rests on ground EXTERNAL to us, which our best judgment pronounces to be absolutely firm.

254. This confidence receives further and remarkable INWARD CONFIRMATION. In Rom. 5^5 Paul teaches that our satisfying consciousness of God's love is poured out in our hearts by the agency of the HOLY SPIRIT given to us. This solitary reference, in chs. 3–6, to the Holy Spirit is explained and supplemented in ch. 8^{15}, ^{16}, where Paul asserts that his readers "have received . . . a Spirit of adoption, in which they cry Abba, Father;" and adds, "the Spirit Itself bears-witness-together-with our spirit that we are children of God."

Notice here two witnesses bearing the same testimony: *συνμαρτυρεῖ*. The same composite word is found in Rom. 2^{15}, 9^{1}; in each case denoting a joint and confirmatory witness.

The Greek word rendered *bear-witness* (*μαρτυρεῖ*) is frequent in N.T. and elsewhere for anything which affords PROOF. So Jno. 5^{36}, 10^{25}, Acts $14^{3, 17}$. In all these cases we have silent witnesses; but they afford convincing proof. In several places, the word *witness* is used in reference to the Spirit of God. In Acts 15^{8} Peter refers to the manifest gift of the Spirit to Cornelius and his friends, as narrated in chs. $10^{44, 47}$, 11^{15}. Notice the composite word in Heb. 2^{4}: "God bearing witness along *with*, and *upon*, their witness:" *συνεπιμαρτυροῦντος*. In another mode, viz. by prompting an O.T. prophet to speak and write, we are told in Heb. 10^{15} that the "Holy Spirit *bears-witness*."

255. How do the Spirit of God and man's own spirit "bear JOINT-WITNESS that we are children of God?" An answer is found in the foregoing verse. For evidently the human cry ("we cry, Abba, Father") is a testimony of a human spirit, revealing consciousness of a filial relation to God. The words "our spirit" are specially appropriate: for experience tells that this cry is a voice, not of man's lower bodily nature, but of that in him which is noblest and nearest to God. This cry is also superhuman. For it is prompted by the Spirit of God: "*in which* (or *in whom*) we cry Abba, Father." By prompting that cry, the Spirit of God affords proof and in this sense "*bears-witness* that we are children of God:" for, if not such, we should have no right to accost Him as our "Father." In other words, the filial confidence in God of those led by the Spirit of God is itself a decisive and divinely-given proof that they are His children. This proof, Paul describes, using a mode of speech frequent in the

N.T., by saying that the Spirit of God joins with our own spirit in bearing witness that we have been adopted into the family of God.

256. Notice carefully that, although our filial confidence in God and our assurance of personal salvation are derived from the Spirit of God, and are confirmed by their own evidently divine origin, they do not at first, nor afterwards as their ULTIMATE GROUND, rest upon this confidence. They rest primarily on words and teaching which we have traced by decisive documentary evidence to the lips of Christ, on the love of God manifested in the historical fact of His death, and on His well-attested resurrection from the dead. To this abundant and decisive objective evidence, we can go back in moments of doubt; and in it find mental and spiritual rest. Yet we infer with confidence that the faith which rests securely on these words and facts is wrought in us by the Spirit of God; and, in the felt presence of the Spirit in our hearts, guiding our steps and breathing into us confidence in God, we find important confirmation of the word which at first, in our guilt and fear and darkness, we ventured to believe.

Similarly, our consciousness of objects around, while evoked in us by those objects, is conditioned by our LIFE and INTELLIGENCE: for the inanimate and irrational are wholly or in great part unconscious of them. Just so, our assurance of future blessing is evoked in us by demonstrated historical facts and by words spoken in our ears, facts and words manifesting the eternal Nature and Purpose of God; and by the Holy Spirit who enables us to understand, and feel the force of, the facts and the words. It has thus an HISTORICAL and LOGICAL GROUND; and a SPIRITUAL SOURCE. Hence Paul is careful both to expound the meaning of the facts and the words and to pay homage to the Spirit who, through

them, gives us an assurance of the favour of God now and of infinite blessing to come. Thus in the new life in Christ we have the mysterious inter-penetration of spirit and form which is co-extensive with life, and especially with human life, as known to us. The spoken and written word is the outward form: the Holy Spirit is the inward and animating principle which pervades the word, and gives to it life and power. For He is "the Spirit of the Truth:" Jno. 14^{17}.

257. The doctrine of assurance expounded above is GUARDED FROM immoral ABUSE by the plain teaching of Paul and John that the judgment of God is against all who commit sin, teaching re-echoed, with an authority we dare not contradict, by the Judge supreme enthroned in the moral sense of man. As examples, I may quote Rom. $2^{1\text{-}29}$, which forms a moral basis for the evangelical teaching which follows; also ch. $8^{1\text{-}16}$, where the two elements are interwoven throughout; Gal. 5^{16}–6^{10}, following chs. 3^{26}–4^{7}; and 1 Jno. 2^{29}–3^{24}, where again the two elements are interwoven. This teaching, thus re-echoed, makes it impossible for us to believe that we enjoy the favour of God while doing that which He condemns. The possible or conceivable or inconceivable case of men whose conscience is so seared that they believe that God smiles on them, even while continuing in sin, because of their faith or of some religious observance, need not perplex us. For any such abnormal development cannot shake the well-grounded confidence of sincere servants of Christ.

CHAPTER XXXI

THE NEW BIRTH

258. IN Jno. $1^{12, 13}$, we read that they who have believed in Christ and thus become children of God have also been "BORN, not from blood," *i.e.* from the characteristic material of living bodies, nor "from the will of flesh," *i.e.* from animal instincts, nor "from the will of man," *i.e.* from human desire and purpose, but "FROM GOD." This implies that, just as by natural birth we enter into a new life and into the visible world and receive powers fitting us for life in it, so in those who believe in Christ a spiritual change has taken place which has given them a new life, a new spiritual environment, and new spiritual powers; and that this new life is from God.

In Jno. 3^{3-8}, similar teaching is traced to Christ. The contrast of *water* and *Spirit* in *v.*^{5} recall the Baptist's words in ch. $1^{26, 33}$: a close parallel in Mt. 3^{11}. That the new life is *from* the *Holy Spirit*, is indisputable: for He is the divine channel of all inward blessing from God to man and the immediate inward source of all life, natural and spiritual. The simplest interpretation of *from water* is as a reference to baptism: see further in § 426. In Jno. 3^{6} we have a comparison and contrast similar to that in ch. 1^{13}. It teaches that, whereas a life derived from a merely animal or human source must be itself only animal or human, a life derived from a spiritual source partakes the higher nature of its source. In *v.*^{8}, we have another comparison, based on the Greek word πνεῦμα, which may be rendered either *spirit* or *wind*: see § 112. Christ points to the *wind*, mysterious in its source and aim, and declares that a similar mystery overhangs one "born from the *Spirit*."

Similar teaching is found in 1 Jno. 2^{29}, 3^{9}, $5^{1, 4, 18}$. These

passages and their context assert that all who believe in Christ and all who do right are "born from God," and that the new life thus received, so long as it lives in them, makes SIN impossible.

Notice carefully 1 Pet. 1^3. Here God is the Author, and the resurrection of Christ the instrument, of a new birth. By raising Him, God gave to men an historical foundation for faith in Christ, and thus virtually raised with Him, to share His resurrection life, all who would afterwards put faith in Him. For, had He not risen, there had been no Gospel, no Pentecost, no saving faith, and no Church of Christ. So *v.*^{21}. The state into which the new life brings those who receive it is one not so much of possession as of "hope." But it is a "living hope:" for it is the inspiration of a new life. The object of this hope is an "inheritance," *i.e.* enrichment to be received in virtue of filial relation to the source of the new life: cp. Rom. 8^{17}. Just so, an heir is born, not to immediate possession, but to hope, of wealth. Similar teaching in 1 Pet. 1^{23}; where the word *seed* recalls 1 Jno. 3^9. Here the Gospel, which is God's voice and word to man, is the instrument of the new birth: for the good news of salvation is the means by which God evokes in man saving faith. Teaching practically the same in Jas. 1^{18}.

259. The above writers, and Christ as His words are recorded in the 4th Gospel, agree to teach that they who believe in Christ have experienced an inward change ANALOGOUS TO BIRTH; or, in other words, have received from God, while the natural life derived from natural birth still lives in them, a new and higher life breathed into them by the Spirit of God, placing them in a new spiritual environment, and giving them new faculties corresponding to it. This new life is, as we saw in § 258, obtained by faith:

cp. Gal. 3^{14}. To the earliest disciples, it was conditioned by a confession of Christ in baptism: for, by ordaining this rite, Christ made it obligatory to all his servants, and in this sense a condition of His favour.

The new birth is mentioned by Paul only in Tit. 3^5: "bath of a new-birth." This recalls Acts 22^{16}, Jno. 3^5; and is most easily explained of baptism. See § 426. An approach to it is found in 1 Cor. 4^{15}. Here, as with Peter and James, the Gospel is the instrument of a new birth: but the spiritual change so described is traced only to the preacher of the Gospel.

260. Justification by Faith, and Adoption, are distinctive elements of the teaching of PAUL: the New Birth is an element common to JOHN, PETER, and JAMES, but mentioned only once by Paul. With his legal bent of mind, he looks at the believer's reception into the family of God, and into the rights of sons, as forensic, *i.e.* simply as a changed relation of man to God, in accordance with the principles of law. But a mere forensic change will not supply man's deep spiritual need. Consequently, Paul supplements this teaching by that of the gift of the Spirit to the adopted sons. So also Eph. $1^{5, 13, 14}$. The Holy Spirit thus given to those who believe becomes in them the animating and directing principle of a new life, makes them conscious of a new environment, and imparts capacities for a new life therein. Other N.T. writers, and Christ as His words are there recorded, look at the same great change from another point of view, and call it a new birth; thus representing it as an entrance into a new life and a new world. The common element underlying these different phrases is the teaching, by nearly all N.T. writers, that they whose sins are forgiven are also SONS OF GOD. Paul, remembering that God gave Christ to die in order to harmonize the pardon of sin with His own justice, calls believers sons

of God by the legal process of ADOPTION; supplementing this by his teaching about the Spirit of Adoption. Others represent them as sons of God in virtue of a NEW BIRTH wrought in them by the Holy Spirit. That this common element gave rise to these two distinct, though harmonious, modes of expression, reveals its deep and firm hold of the thought of the early followers of Christ.

261. RESULTS ATTAINED. In ch. 18, we found man guilty of actual sin, and thus shut out from the smile of God and exposed to the penalty which inevitably follows sin, and unable either to win back the favour of God or to obey in the future; but at the same time an object of influences from God tending towards repentance and righteousness, and revealing a purpose of God to save fallen and rebellious man. The accomplishment of this purpose has now begun. We have seen man rescued from ruin, and entering a path which leads to the glorious inheritance of the sons of God.

To the sinner, God has revealed his sin and ruin, has thus forced from him a cry for deliverance, and evoked in him an earnest purpose to forsake sin. The penitent has heard the good news of salvation announced by Christ: and, in view of the infinite love manifested on His cross and the infinite power manifested in His resurrection, he has ventured to believe it. He has thus come within the number of those for whom Christ announced pardon. Although his original rights as a son of God were forfeited by sin, God has received the now justified sinner into His family and has counted him a fellow-heir of the Eternal Son.

Moreover, the adopting Father has put into the bosom of His adopted sons the Spirit of the Firstborn to be in them the animating principle of a new life like that of Christ. The Spirit thus given is a new moral power breaking the

fetters of past sin, and a fruitful seed of all virtues. He also reveals to them the infinite love of God manifested in the death of Christ; and thus evokes in them the filial cry, My Father God. This cry, the believer recognises as no mere human voice, but the voice of that Spirit who has already, by breaking the bonds of sin, proved Himself to be the Spirit of God. This filial confidence in God thus becomes a decisive confirmation of that Gospel which in his sin and helplessness he dared to believe. Thus a cry from man to God becomes a voice from God to man assuring the adopted children of their adoption into the family of God. This inbreathed Spirit imparts a new and divine life, brings us into a new spiritual environment, and endows us with new faculties corresponding to it.

Man is thus restored to his normal relation to God. At his creation, God breathed into him His own life, thus making him a son of God: cp. Lk. 3^{38}. This sonship, lost by sin, is now restored: and man rejoices in the smile of a loving Father in heaven. But the child of God is born, not to immediate possession, but to the hope, of a great inheritance. Moreover, he is in a state of probation, not at the end, but at the beginning, of the path which leads to life eternal. The way is beset by enemies and perils. But the infinite cost at which God has opened for man an entrance into this way of life assures us that He will give whatever is needed to guide and guard His children along it.

It remains to us to trace this path; to note its relation to other paths, and to various objects in man's environment, the safeguards by which it is protected, and the goal to which it leads.

CHAPTER XXXII

THE WAY OF HOLINESS

262. IN Rom. 1^{7}, 8^{27}, 12^{13}, $15^{25, 26, 31}$, $16^{2, 15}$, etc., the word SAINT or HOLY (ἅγιος) is used as a common designation of the servants of Christ: cp. Acts $9^{13, 32, 41}$, 26^{10}; Rev. 5^{8}, $8^{3, 4}$, $13^{7, 10}$, etc. This term as used in the N.T., with its cognates *holy*, *hallow*, *holiness*, and its other renderings *saint*, *sanctify*, *sanctification*, will shed important light on the new life of the adopted sons of God. These words are the more conspicuous because of their rarity in classical Greek; and their use in the LXX. as a constant rendering of a family of Hebrew words found in the O.T. more than 800 times. This directs us to the O.T. for the ideas conveyed by the word *holy* in the New Testament.

263. These words are found in GENESIS only once, in a passage closely related to Exodus: Gen. 2^{3}. This suggests that the idea conveyed by the word belongs specifically to the covenant given through Moses as distinguished from the earlier covenant with Abraham.

In the solemn opening scene of that covenant, from the lips of God, we hear the great word henceforth to be so deeply inwoven into the religious life of Israel and of the world. The words in Ex. 3^{5}, "Draw not nigh hither . . . for the place thou art standing upon is ground of *holiness*," introduce a covenant of which one great feature was to be HOLINESS embodied in visible places and things, a holiness which made the holy objects partly or altogether inaccessible to man. Evidently, God wished to say that the ground stood in special relation to Himself; and that, because it

was God's ground, none could tread it except by His command.

Very instructive is Ex. 13^2: "*sanctify* for Me the firstborn . . . IT IS MINE." So *v.*^{12}: cp. Num. 3^{12f}, 8^{16f}, Dt. 15^{19}. These passages make quite clear the meaning of the word *sanctify*. The firstborn were to be *holy* in the sense that God had claimed them to be in a special sense His own, *i.e.* to be His property and His servants, acting only at His bidding and to work out His purposes. In other words, they were to be not THEIR OWN, but GOD'S. Same idea in Ex. 19^{5f}; where the word *holy* is linked with the priestly ritual soon to be established. Just as in Egypt God had already declared that the firstborn should stand in special relation to Him as His property, in virtue of their deliverance from the destroyer, so now He says that the entire nation shall stand in similar, (though not quite the same,) relation to Himself, in virtue (*v.*^{4}) of its deliverance from Egypt. We have here an anticipation of the holiness attributed in N.T. to every member of the Church. Cp. Lv. 11^{45}, 20^{26}. With Ex. 3^5, cp. ch. 19^{23}: by putting a fence, Moses was to mark off Mount Sinai as belonging to God, and therefore not to be trodden by man or beast except at His bidding.

264. Beneath the shadow of the holy mountain now rises before us the complicated solemnity of the MOSAIC RITUAL, of which every vessel and every rite bears on its front, in broad and deep characters, the name of *holiness*. In Ex. 20^8, God bids Israel, "remember the Sabbath Day to *sanctify* it;" and adds in *v.*^{11}, "Jehovah blessed the seventh day and *sanctified* it:" cp. ch. 31^{14}, Gen. 2^3, Isa. 58^{13}. The tabernacle is called the *sanctuary* or *holy* place: Ex. 25^8. The outer chamber bears the abstract title *holiness*: the inner one bears the superlative name *holiness of holinesses*, conveniently rendered HOLY OF HOLIES: ch. 26^{33}. The same august superlative

title is, in ch. 29^{37}, given to the brazen altar; in ch. 30^{29}, to the vessels of the tabernacle; and in Lv. 2^{3}, to the bodies of animals offered in sacrifice, of which the unburnt parts were to be given to the priests as God's representatives. So absolute was the holiness of the sacred objects that God said three times, in Ex. 29^{37}, 30^{29}, Lv. 6^{18}, "whatever touches the altar shall be *holy*:" *i.e.* by that touch it ceases to be man's, and must henceforth be used only for the purposes of God. Aaron and his clothes, and his sons and their clothes, were holy: Ex. 29^{21}. So, emphatically, was the oil: ch. 30^{32}. Houses, fields, and cattle, were made *holy* by consecration to God: Lv. $27^{9\text{-}21}$, "the field shall be *holy* for Jehovah, like the field of the *anathema*; for the priest, the possession of it shall be." The word I have rendered (as in LXX.) *anathema* is in *v.*^{28} made equivalent to *holy of holies*: it denotes (see *v.*^{29}) an irrevocable consecration. The Nazarite was *holy*, and his sacrifice "*holiness* for the priest:" Num. $6^{5, 8, 20}$. The censers of Korah (Num. 16^{38}) were *holy*; and therefore could not be put to common use. The fourth year's fruit of the land of Canaan was *holy*: Lv. 19^{24}. Lastly, God says to Israel in Dt. 7^{6}: "a *holy* people thou art for Jehovah thy God: thee has Jehovah thy God chosen to be His, for a people of special possession beyond all the peoples which are on the face of the earth."

These passages, from Ex.—Dt., are samples of hundreds of others. In all, the meaning is the same, and is clearly marked. These various sacred objects are NOT MAN'S, BUT GOD'S: consequently, none can touch them except at His bidding; else they will be guilty (Mal. 3^{8}) of robbing God. The word *holy* is the inviolable Broad-Arrow of the divine King of Israel.

265. The sanctification of the firstborn, the Sabbath, the tabernacle and altar, and Aaron and his sons is in Nm. 3^{13},

Ex. 20^{11}, 29^{44} attributed to GOD. For the devotion of these objects originated, not in man, but in God. And, apart from anything man does or fails to do, His claim places them in a new and peculiar relation to Him: *e.g.* man might profane the Sabbath; but it remained a holy day, which God had claimed for Himself. This relation, created by God's claim and incapable of being destroyed by man's unfaithfulness, may be called OBJECTIVE HOLINESS. It is the most common use of the word.

In Ex. 19^{14}, 28^{41}, 29^{1}, $40^{9\text{-}13}$, MOSES, as the minister through whom was brought about the devotion to God of these objects claimed by Him, is said to have SANCTIFIED Mount Sinai, Aaron, and the tabernacle and its vessels. Similarly, in Ex. 19^{22}, Lv. 11^{44}, 27^{14}, the priests and people are said to sanctify themselves and some of their possessions. They did this, either by formally placing themselves and their goods at the disposal of God, or by separating themselves from everything inconsistent with His service. This may be called SUBJECTIVE HOLINESS. It is man's surrender to God of that which He has claimed. This distinction of *objective* and *subjective* holiness is of utmost importance. The former traces holiness to its source in God: the latter points to the obligation laid on man by this claim of God. So, in Ex. $20^{8,\ 11}$, man is bidden to sanctify the Sabbath, because God has already sanctified it.

266. Light is shed on the radical meaning of the word *holy* by Gen. 38^{21}, Dt. 23^{17}, 1 Kgs. 14^{24}, which recall the "sacred slave-girls" at Corinth, "whom both men and women presented to the goddess:" Strabo bk. 8^{378}. The essential idea of holiness is found here, though in a peculiar form. For devotion to an impure deity creates impurity in the devotee; whereas devotion to God implies separation from all impurity. Another trace of the word is found in

the name *Kadesh*, in Gen. 14^{7}, 16^{14}, 20^{1}, Nm. 13^{26}, Josh. 20^{7}, 1 Chr. 6^{72}, etc. Like the name *Hierapolis*, it suggests a town specially devoted to some deity.

267. Throughout the O.T., the word *holy* and its cognates are found in the meaning expounded above. So Josh. 3^{5}, 5^{15}, 6^{19}, 20^{7}, Jud. 17^{3}, Job 1^{5}, Ps. 106^{16}, 2 Chr. 23^{6}, etc. Very interesting, as anticipating a deeper use of the word, are 2 Kgs. 4^{9}, Isa. 4^{3}, 62^{12}, Dan. $7^{18\text{-}27}$, Zech. 14^{20f}. Also Pss. 16^{3}, 34^{9}, 89^{5}, Job 5^{1}, 15^{15}.

For the holiness of God, see § 84.

The prominence and VARIETY of the objects called *holy* in the O.T. and the definiteness of the one idea presented by all these objects make the meaning of the word quite clear. Everything *holy* stands in special relation to God as His possession; and therefore must not be used or touched by man except at His bidding, and to do His work. He has claimed them for His own: and His claim lays upon man an obligation to devote them to His service.

268. An all-important LINK between O.T. and N.T. is the Greek word ἅγιος used constantly, with its cognates, in the LXX. as an equivalent for the Hebrew word קדוֹשׁ. Another and more exact equivalent, ἱερός, was ready to hand; but was never used. For the corrupt associations of idolatry had made it unfit for service in the temple of God. The rare word ἅγιος had few associations of its own, and was therefore fitter to take up the meaning and association of the Hebrew word. Moreover, its few associations were appropriate. It is never found in classical Greek as a predicate of gods or men; and was therefore free from the ideas of imperfection and sin which belonged, in the minds of idolaters, to both gods and men; but is sometimes used to describe temples of special sacredness. It is probably akin to ἄζομαι, used by

Homer to denote reverence for the gods or for parents. Even the cognates of ἱερός are rejected in the Lxx.: and in place of them we find a family of words of which every member was new in Greek literature.

In the APOCRYPHA, the use of ἅγιος and its cognates corresponds exactly to its use in the Lxx.: so Judith 11^{13}, 1 Macc. 10^{39}, Sir. $45^{4.\ 6.\ 10}$; 49^{12}, $33(36)^{9}$, 48^{20}, 2 Macc. 8^{23}. In 2 Macc. 5^{15} we have ἱερόν in the sense of *sanctuary*. This was now safe: for the O.T. conception of holiness was indissolubly linked to ἅγιος, which is used in this last passage as a description of ἱερόν. In the Apocrypha, as in the Lxx., the word ἅγιος simply takes up the ideas associated with the Hebrew word; and passes them on unchanged, as an almost lifeless body, awaiting the new life soon to be breathed into it by a new revelation.

269. The New Testament writers perpetuate and develop the O.T. conception of holiness. Ex. 13^{2} is reproduced in Lk. 2^{23}; and the emphatic teaching of Ex. 29^{37}, in Mt. $23^{17.\ 19}$, where the temple is said to have already "*sanctified* the gold" used in its construction, and day by day "the altar *sanctifies* (notice the tenses) the gift" laid upon it. Acts 8^{33} recalls Ex. 3^{5}; and Mt. 4^{5}, 27^{53} recall Neh. 11^{1}. In Mt. 24^{15}, Acts 6^{13}, 21^{28}, the temple is still called "the holy place." The word *holy*, used in Job 5^{1}, 15^{15}, Dan. 8^{13} to designate the angels, as occupying a special relation to God and doing His work, is applied to them as an epithet in Lk. 9^{26}, Acts 10^{22}. Similarly, as in Jer. 1^{5} so in Lk. 1^{70}, Acts 3^{21}, it is applied to the prophets: cp. Mk. 6^{20} with 2 Kgs. 4^{9}. All this proves how fully the O.T. conception of holiness lived on in the thought of Israel to the days of Christ.

Very conspicuous, especially in Luke and Acts, is the term "*Holy* Spirit," already used in the Lxx. in Ps. 51^{11}, Isa. 63^{10}

as a rendering of the phrase "Spirit of *Holiness*." The Spirit of God claims this title as being in a unique sense the Source of an influence of which God is the one aim: see § 118.

270. In Rom. 1^{7}, Eph. 1^{1}, Ph. 1^{1}, Col. 1^{2}, Paul addresses his readers as "called to be SAINTS" or "called *saints*:" and in 1 Cor. 1^{2} this phrase is expounded "*sanctified* in Christ." In Rom. 8^{27}, 12^{13}, $15^{25, 26, 32}$, 16^{2}, and elsewhere frequently, he addresses them as *saints* Just as he had himself received a summons from God which made him an apostle, so they had received one which made them *saints*, or *holy* men. So Heb. 3^{1}, 6^{10}, 13^{24}, Jude^{3}, Acts $9^{13, 32, 41}$, 26^{10}, Rev. 5^{8}, $8^{3, 4}$, 16^{6}, 17^{6}, 18^{24}, etc. Evidently the ordinary members of the early churches were commonly called *saints*. That this use of the word is not found in the Gospels, reminds us that not till the day of Pentecost did the sacred race begin to be.

The earliest readers of the N.T. could not but give to the word *holy*, when used to describe the servants of Christ, a MEANING DERIVED FROM its familiar USE IN THE O.T. read week by week in their synagogues; a use found also, as we have just seen, in the New Testament. Certainly the holy persons of the New Covenant must stand in close relation to those of the Old. Notice however that in the latter the word *holy* was reserved for the priests as distinguished from other Israelites: so, conspicuously, Nm. 16^{3-10}, 2 Chr. 23^{6}. This reservation, maintained throughout most of the O.T., teaches that the priests stood in a special relation to God not shared by others. The N.T. use quoted above teaches that all the servants of Christ stand in special RELATION TO GOD. It thus marks an all-important contrast between the covenants.

271. The title *saint* is in the N.T. given even to IMMATURE church-members: so 1 Cor. 1^{2}, 3^{1}. So in O.T. the priests, whatever their actual conduct and character might be, were, as men whom God had claimed for Himself and who were

therefore bound to devote themselves wholly to His service, objectively *holy*: for God's claim laid upon them a new obligation not set aside by, though greatly aggravating, their unfaithfulness. Just so, God now claims for Himself all those whom He receives as His adopted sons: and, whatever they do, His claim puts them in a new and very solemn position. The word "saint" is therefore a very appropriate designation of the followers of Christ: for it declares what God requires them to be. To admit sin or selfishness into their hearts is sacrilege. It also points out their privilege. By calling His people *saints*, God declares His will that we live a life of which He is the only aim. Therefore, since our own efforts have proved that such a life is far beyond our power, we may take back to God the name He gives us and claim that it be realised by His power in our heart and life. These all-important truths were kept before the earliest Christians by the common term *saints* by which they designated themselves. This is the OBJECTIVE HOLINESS of the servants of Christ.

272. But, although in this sense all are holy, the full idea of holiness is realised only so far as we yield to God the devotion He claims. Consequently, in a few passages, the word *holy* denotes actual and absolute devotion to God: and this is set before the readers as a standard for their attainment. So Jno. $17^{17\text{-}19}$, 1 Cor. $7^{33,\ 34}$, Eph. 1^{4}, 5^{27}, Col. 1^{22}, 1 Th. 5^{23}, Heb. 12^{14}, 1 Pet. 1^{15}. The words *holy* and *sanctify* here denote a realisation in man of God's purpose that he live a life of which God is the one and only aim. In this sense, that man is *holy* who looks upon himself and all his possessions as belonging to God, and uses all his time, powers, and opportunities to work out His purposes, *i.e.* to advance the Kingdom of God. This is the SUBJECTIVE HOLINESS to which He calls His servants.

When men are called *saints*, as already *holy*, the word must be understood in its objective sense, as noting what God claims them to be; but, when holiness is represented as an aim to be pursued, it evidently denotes actual devotion to God. This double use of the word explains why the worldly-minded Corinthians (1 Cor. 1^2) were said to be already "sanctified in Christ," whereas for others (1 Th. 5^{23}) with whom Paul finds no fault he prays that "God may sanctify" them and thus bring them to completeness and maturity. This subjective holiness is further described in Rom. 6^{11}, "reckon yourselves to be living for God in Christ;" 1 Cor. 6^{19}, 3^{23}, "ye are not your own, but Christ's;" 2 Cor. 5^{15}, "He died in order that they who live may live no longer for themselves, but for Him who on their behalf died and rose."

273. Since holiness, as set forth in the Mosaic ritual, was a prophetic outline of the holiness required in us, the various HOLY OBJECTS of that ritual were TYPES, as of Christ, so also of His followers. We are a "temple," 1 Cor. 3^{16}, 6^{19}, 2 Cor. 6^{16}; a "priesthood," 1 Pet. $2^{5, 9}$; a "sacrifice," Rom. 12^1. Cp. Jno. 2^{21}, Heb. 3^1, 10^{10}. Our future life will be a "Sabbath-keeping:" Heb. 4^9. That in the N.T. the word *sanctify* occurs most frequently in the Ep. to the Hebrews, in which the Mosaic ritual is so conspicuous, suggests that in the Apostolic churches the word had not shaken off, as to a large extent it has now, its original connection with that ritual. To this original reference we must ever recur if we wish to think of holiness as it was understood by the earliest Christians.

Interesting examples of the use of the word *holy* in a context suggesting the O.T. ritual are found in Rom. 12^1, 15^{16}, 1 Cor. 7^{14}, 1 Tim. 4^4; 1 Pet. 2^5. Evidently here it takes over the entire connotation of the same word in the ancient ritual. Just as God sanctified (Nm. 3^{13}) for Himself the first-born,

so in Christ He has claimed for Himself, and in this sense *sanctified*, all those whom (Col. 1[13]) He has rescued from the power of darkness and brought into the Kingdom of Christ. Yet Christ (Jno. 17[17, 19]) and Paul (1 Th. 5[23]) still pray that God *may sanctify* them, in the sense of working in them the devotion He requires.

274. The real significance of the above teaching, we shall best appreciate by reverent contemplation of its supreme realisation in the INCARNATE SON OF GOD. Occasionally He is spoken of as *holy*: Lk. 1[35], Mk. 1[24], Jno. 6[69], 10[36], 17[19], Acts 3[14], 4[27], Rev. 3[7]; probably 1 Jno. 2[20]: cp. Rom. 1[4]. We also find Him, in Jno. 4[34], 5[19, 30], 6[38], 17[4]; Rom. 6[10], 15[3], Heb. 3[2], 9[14], standing in special relation to God, and living a life of which the one and only aim is to advance the purposes of God. In Him we see a life lived in human flesh and blood, in which all powers, time, and opportunities were used, not to gratify self, but to work out the Father's purposes. This devotion was rational. The human intelligence of Jesus, mysteriously informed by the divine intelligence of the Eternal Son, comprehended and fully approved and appropriated the Father's eternal purpose to save mankind: and of this intelligent approval every word and act of the human life of Jesus was a perfect outworking. In this sense, in a degree infinitely surpassing whatever had been known before, He was *holy*. Whatever holiness belonged to the ritual and priesthood of the Old Covenant, belonged in infinitely higher degree to Him: whatever in them was imperfect, found in Him its full development.

In the O.T., the holy men were separated by their holiness from the work of common life. This was very conspicuous in the "holy man" (Mk. 6[20]) in whose person and teaching was summed up whatever had been revealed under the earlier

dispensation. John lived in the wilderness, and ate strange food: Jesus lived a common life, toiling at a trade, enjoying social intercourse, partaking of human hospitality, and eating the food set before Him. This teaches plainly that holiness in its highest degree, *i.e.* the highest conceivable devotion to God and to the advancement of His Kingdom, does not separate from the common business of life. And, when we see Jesus using the opportunities afforded Him by this intercourse with men to advance the Kingdom of God, we learn that even the common things of daily life may be laid on the altar of God as a means of doing His holy work.

275. The only purpose of God having a practical bearing on us is His PURPOSE TO SAVE MEN from sin and death, and to set up the eternal kingdom of which Christ will be King and His people citizens. Consequently, this one divine purpose is inseparably linked with our conception of holiness. This explains Jno. 10^{36}, 17^{19}. The Father offered the Son, and the Son ever offers (notice the tenses) Himself, upon the altar of our salvation.

276. In § 92 we found in the N.T. clear teaching about a PERSON distinct from the Father, yet sharing with Him by eternal derivation from Him, all the attributes of God: and we saw, in § 95, the divine life thus received flowing back, with full volume, in unreserved DEVOTION to the Father; the infinite and eternal Stream to its infinite and eternal Source. Of this eternal devotion of the Son to the Father, the lifelong consecration of Jesus to the work of saving men was a human historic outflow. And we have now seen that this self-consecration of Christ is a perfect realisation, in actual human life, of the holiness symbolically set forth in the O.T. ritual; and of the holiness set before the servants of Christ in the N.T. as their duty and privilege. Thus is the Biblical conception of holiness, set forth in outline

in the Mosaic ritual and afterwards fully realised in the human life of Christ on earth, traced up to its ultimate source in the eternal nature of God, to the eternal devotion of the Son to the Father.

277. The above teaching reveals the abiding practical WORTH of the MOSAIC RITUAL, as a symbol of the new life in Christ. To this abiding value, abundant witness is borne in Christian literature, and especially in sacred song. In all ages and countries, Christian thought has found appropriate expression in the phraseology of the ancient ritual. This abiding spiritual benefit of symbols which have long ago passed away reveals their divine origin and thus renders important confirmation to the narratives which trace them to commands given by God to Israel. Of this far-reaching benefit, the O.T. writers seem to have been themselves almost unconscious. And their unconsciousness of the real significance of that which they carefully describe indicates clearly a Hand unseen guiding their hands, or at least attests the divine origin of that which they describe. That in this remarkable manner the Old Covenant prepares a way for the New, proves that it came from Him who in later days sent His Son to announce the salvation dimly foreshadowed in the ancient symbols. This confirmation extends only to the broad principles underlying the ritual, not to all its details; and it sheds little light on the authorship or age of the documents from which we derive our knowledge of the ritual. But it affords important evidence for the general historical truth of these documents.

CHAPTER XXXIII

THE NEW LIFE OF DEVOTION TO CHRIST

278. WE have now seen that the eternal Son lives a life of UNRESERVED DEVOTION to the Father, a life in which all the infinite powers derived from the Father are put forth for the accomplishment of His purposes; and that, in the incarnate Son, this devotion assumed visible form in the consecration, to God and to the salvation of men, of all the human powers assumed by the Son at His entrance into human life. In Him we see a pure human life, lived under the conditions imposed by flesh and blood, amid human weakness and bad and hostile men and under the fierce attack of spiritual foes; a life of unswerving loyalty to God and to the great purpose for which God sent His Son into the world; a created human life in full harmony with the divine life of the eternal Son. This one definite aim, unwaveringly pursued by the incarnate Son, gave to HUMAN LIFE a unity and DIGNITY unknown before and otherwise inconceivable.

We have also seen that the associations of the word HOLY in the O.T., its use in the N.T. as applied to the servants of Christ, and other N.T. teaching about the life God would have them live, implies that Christ claims from them an unreserved devotion to Himself like His own devotion to God. He claims that we use all our powers of body and mind, all the resources at our disposal, and all the opportunities which life affords, to save men from sin, to bring them to bow to Christ, and to help them to serve Christ; and that we do all this for His sake. In short, He claims that all our purposes be subordinated to His one great

purpose, intelligently and earnestly embraced by us. Such is the new and definite IDEAL LIFE set, in the N.T., before the servants of Christ.

279. This is the noblest life possible to man: for it sets before us an AIM, the best possible, one which every one can pursue at all times and in all circumstances, in pursuit of which he can use all his powers, and which all men can attain. Now an aim perseveringly pursued gives to life unity, force, and grandeur. This has sometimes been the case even when the aim has been unworthy. Life has then been a ruin, perhaps a splendid ruin. Now all self-chosen aims must needs be earthly and selfish, and therefore unworthy. For the stream cannot rise above its source. But God, in order to ennoble even the humblest of His children, has given Himself and His own purpose of mercy in Christ to be their single aim; that thus, by directing their efforts towards the accomplishment of a purpose chosen by divine wisdom and love, they may themselves daily rise towards God.

This aim commends itself to us as WORTHY of our highest effort, and of any sacrifice it may involve. For God's purpose is the rescue of the perishing, the highest good of all men, and the setting up of the eternal and glorious Kingdom of God. Christ's own consecration to this purpose claims our profound homage. He now bids us make His purpose our own: and, embraced by us, it satisfies us as being worthy of our most strenuous and sustained effort. Thus loyalty to Christ becomes loyalty to the highest interests of men.

Devotion to Christ stimulates EVERY KIND OF EXCELLENCE, and in the highest degree. For His work demands the exercise of all our powers. It stimulates intellectual effort to know all we can about God and Christ and the Gospel, in order that we may lead others through Christ to God; and thus gives to human intelligence its noblest aim, and

guards intellectual success from the moral perils which surround it. It gives a worthy motive for the care and development of the body: for our service is conditioned by bodily health and strength. And it gives the only pure motive, and a very strong one, for effort after material good: for consecrated wealth may be a means of spiritual good to others, and thus become to the owner treasure in heaven. In this way, loyalty to Christ calls into exercise, and thus develops and elevates, all our powers, bodily, intellectual, and moral.

This life of loyalty, and it only, is in full harmony with God's CREATIVE PURPOSE. For it puts into active exercise powers designed to be thus exercised, and capable of their highest well-being only by exercise. It sets before us an object which commands the full approval of our intelligence. The mind, designed to rule, now actually rules: and the body, designed to obey, attains its goal by acting under the direction of that which is nobler than itself. Consequently, in him who lives for Christ there is perfect harmony and peace, and highest activity. In him is attained the purpose of the creation of the universe: Col. 1^{16}.

This ideal life is practicable, in the highest degree, to ALL PERSONS in all positions. He who has fewest powers may use them all for the advancement of the Kingdom of God: and he whose circumstances are most adverse may yet do all he can; and, if so, even adversity will show forth the glory, and help forward the work, of Him whose grace is ever sufficient. Moreover, devotion to Christ fits a man for every position in life. By making men right with God, it makes them right one with another. For God's purpose is the highest good of all: consequently the man who makes it his own, will do all possible good to all with his reach. He will therefore be a good father, a good citizen, a good neighbour, or a tradesman pleasant and profitable to deal with.

280. Whole-hearted loyalty is possible only for such as we LOVE supremely. God therefore claims our love. So conspicuously, Dt. 6^{4f}, Mt. 22^{37}, Rom. 8^{28}, 1 Cor. 2^{9}, 8^{3}, Jas. 1^{12}, 2^{5}, 1 Jno. 4^{20f}, 5^{1f}; Jno. 14^{21-28}, 1 Cor. 16^{21}, Eph. 6^{24}, 1 Pet. 1^{8}: see § 311. This love to Himself God evokes in us by manifesting, in the mission and death of Christ, His own infinite love to man: so 1 Jno. 4^{9f}, Rom. 5^{5-8}. This manifested love of God to man melts even man's hard heart into love to God. Nay, more. It moves us to love those for whom God gave His Son to die; thus making mutual and universal love the law of the new life: Mt. 5^{43-46}, 19^{19}, $22^{37, 39}$, Jno. $15^{12, 17}$, Rom. 13^{8f}, Gal. 5^{14}, 1 Th. 4^{9}, 1 Jno. $3^{11, 23}$, etc. All this love of man to God and of man to man is a reflection of God's love to us: 1 Jno. 4^{19}.

Between love to God and love to our fellows is, however, an important difference. We love God because He is Himself infinitely WORTHY OF OUR LOVE. But many of our neighbours are repulsive and hostile. We love them in Christ and for Christ's sake: and in Christ they become worthy of our love. For in His great sacrifice we learn the essential worth of manhood, which even sin does not wholly efface. This inherent worth of lost humanity has been felt by thousands who have spent lives of hardship and peril to rescue the vilest and worst, and have found an abundant recompense in their salvation.

We now see that God's claim to the devotion of all His servants to His great work of saving men from sin and building up, out of the ruins of lost humanity, an eternal and glorious kingdom comes to us from One who so loved us, that to save us and the world, He laid down His life. Such love, we cannot resist: 2 Cor. 5^{14}. Henceforth our love to Christ and to God becomes devotion to the cause for which He died: and in the light of His great sacrifice

any peril or hardship endured by His servants sinks into insignificance. They rejoice to lay themselves and all they have on the altar consecrated by His blood. Thus in Christ and in His death God not only claims for Himself and His Kingdom the unreserved devotion of all His servants, but gives them the strongest conceivable MOTIVE for whole-hearted and joyful surrender of that which He claims.

281. This life of unreserved devotion to God in the service of Christ is a NEW AND CONSPICUOUS FEATURE of the Gospel of Christ. Before His day, men had recognised, especially in Rome, that the interests of the individual are bound up in those of the community; and this truth raised patriotism into a sacred duty. Loyalty to God was enjoined by the teachers of ancient Israel: and many religions have demanded from their votaries costly sacrifices. But not till Christ came was there set before each of the servants of God one definite work, viz. to save and bless all within their reach by leading them to devote their powers to the service of God. This lofty conception, affording a new standard of duty and excellence and thus creating a new Ethic, we have traced by decisive documentary evidence to the early followers of Christ and to Christ Himself. A way was prepared for it, as we saw in ch. 32, in symbolic teaching underlying the ancient ritual of Israel, a teaching whose real significance is explained only by the Gospel of Christ.

CHAPTER XXXIV

SANCTIFICATION IN THE SPIRIT AND THROUGH FAITH

282. WE have now learnt that Christ claims that we live a life in which all our powers are put forth to advance His rule over men; and that only so far as this aim is embraced by us and worked out into the details of our life do we attain our highest well-being. He thus sets before us a new and loftier ideal of excellence, a new and higher law. The realisation of this ideal is the task of the Christian life.

Evidently the first step towards this realisation is a deliberate and resolute purpose to devote ourselves to His service. This involves a surrender of all other purposes except so far as they are subordinate to this one great purpose; and acceptance of a path marked out not by our own choice, but by the will of Another. This initial and continued self-surrender is the costly sacrifice which Christ demands, the costliest sacrifice which man can lay on the altar of God.

To this SELF-CONSECRATION, Paul summons his readers in Rom. $6^{13, 19}$, 12^{1}, 2 Cor. 7^{1}. These exhortations imply that it must be, in a real sense, their own act. Sad to say, the more resolutely we determine to live for Christ, the more painfully conscious do we become of our inability to do so. We find in ourselves a hostile force hindering our purpose and even more or less dethroning it: and this felt inability to fulfil our own resolve becomes an intolerable bondage and condemnation. For deliverance from this bondage, and for realisation in ourselves of this new life of loyalty to Christ, we turn again, as when seeking pardon for past sins, to the Gospel of Christ.

283. That in days to come GOD WILL WORK IN MAN complete inward deliverance, is promised clearly in Dt. 30^{6}, Ezek. $36^{25\text{-}27}$: cp. Ps. $51^{7,\ 10}$. This teaching raises the O.T. far above all contemporary literature, gives it abiding value even to the disciples of Christ, and is a decisive indication of a special revelation given to Israel in addition to the revelation given to all men in nature and in the moral sense, and leading up to the supreme revelation afterwards given in Christ.

284. That the new life is a work in man of the creative power of God, is clearly taught in Ph. 1^{6}, 2^{12f}, 2 Cor. 5^{17}, Gal. 6^{15}, Eph. 1^{19f}, 2^{10}, 4^{24}. Of this divine activity, the SPIRIT OF GOD is the Agent: for, as we saw in §§ 111, 114, He is the divine Bearer in man of the presence and activity of God. That He is the animating principle of the new life in Christ, is conspicuously taught in Gal. $3^{2f,\ 13f}$, $5^{16,\ 18,\ 22}$, Rom. $8^{1\text{-}14}$, 1 Cor. 3^{16}, 6^{19}, 2 Cor. 1^{22}, Eph. $1^{13,\ 17}$; 3^{16}; 5^{18}: cp. Lk. 11^{13}, Jno. 7^{39}; Mt. 3^{11}, Acts 1^{5}. Abundant and various testimony throughout the N.T. leaves no room to doubt that Christ promised the Holy Spirit to His disciples to be in them the source and guide and power of a life not human but divine. The Spirit who fitted Sampson and Bezaleel for their work, and made the prophets to be the voice of God to men, is given to be in us, making us also to be the arm and hand and voice of God. Against this inward divine power, no hostile force, human or natural or diabolical, can prevail: and the wisdom thus given is able to guide in every perplexity. That the Spirit will be given to all the servants of God, is a distinctive promise of the Gospel of Christ: Joel 2^{28f}.

285. Another new feature is that He is also the SPIRIT OF CHRIST, *i.e.* of Him who lived a human life of unreserved devotion to God: so Rom. 8^{9}, Gal. 4^{6}: cp. 1 Pet. 1^{11}.

Consequently, the indwelling of the Spirit is the actual presence of Christ in us, the source in us of a life like that of Christ: so Rom. 8^{10}, Gal. 2^{20}. Their life is thus, in some sense, a continuation of His Incarnation. He who once manifested Himself in the body born from Mary now manifests Himself in His servants on earth by His Spirit dwelling in them. Other teachers can impart knowledge and set a worthy example: but Christ puts His own life into His pupils, His own intelligence to enlighten them, His own moral strength to make them strong, and His own love to be the mainspring of their life.

This gift of the Spirit is evidently sufficient for all our needs. As Bearer of the intelligence of Christ, He reveals to us God's great purpose of salvation, and thus leads us to approve and embrace it. As Bearer of the moral power of Christ, He maintains that purpose in us, in spite of allurements around, and gives us moral strength to work it out in the various details of life. We are conscious that our life and purposes and actions have their source not in ourselves but in God; and we are led onward and upwards by a wisdom and power not human but divine. No longer do we live, but Christ lives in us.

286. The above doctrine, that whatever God claims from us He is ready to work in us by His Spirit dwelling in our hearts, places the moral life of man in a light altogether new. Apart from the Spirit, we could obey God only by our own moral strength, which experience has proved to be utter weakness. Consequently, even the yoke of Christ was a burden we could not bear. But now every command is a virtual promise: for it declares what God is ready to work in us. We have learnt the prayer of Augustine, "Give what Thou bidst, and bid what Thou wilt:" *Confessions* bk. 10^{29}. The ancient moral law and the new and broader law o

Christ have become to us a Gospel of joy. 'Thy statutes have been my songs in the house of my pilgrimage."

287. We now ask, How may we obtain for ourselves the new life breathed into men by the Spirit of God? That the condition sought for is IN MAN, that on himself alone depends whether, and to what degree, the new life is appropriated by each one, we shall learn in ch. 39. The N.T. writers agree to teach that, just as FAITH is the one condition of pardon, so it is of this new life in the Spirit of God. So Paul writes in Gal. 2^{20}, "the life I now live in flesh, I live *in faith* of the Son of God:" *i.e.* a faith which is a reliance on the character and word of Christ, the Son of God. Cp. Gal. $3^{2, 14}$, 5^{6}, 2 Cor. 5^{7}, Eph. $1^{13, 19}$, 3^{17}, Col. 2^{12}, 2 Th. 2^{13}. Of such faith, we have a graphic picture in Rom. $4^{18\text{-}21}$.

Very important is Rom. 6^{11}, where Paul bids his readers, "reckon yourselves dead to sin but living for God in Christ Jesus," just as (*v.*^{10}) Christ Himself "once died to sin" and now upon the throne "lives for God." See my *Commentary*. This reckoning can be no other than the process of intelligent *faith*. For it evidently involves a conviction that we are, or from the moment of our reckoning shall be, by inward spiritual contact with Christ who once died and now lives, dead to sin and living for God. Now this reckoning would be an illusion unless that which we reckon be true, or at once become true. And, if true, it must be wrought in us by the power and Spirit of God. For all experience proves that apart from such divine inworking we are neither dead to sin nor living for God. Consequently, the reckoning to which Paul exhorts is an assurance based on the word and promise of God that from this moment we shall be, by His grace, separated from all sin and living a life of unreserved devotion to Him. Such assurance is faith.

288. The examples of faith in Heb. 11 were given (ch. 10^{22f}) as an encouragement to approach God "in full assurance of faith" and to "hold fast the confession of hope without wavering:" cp. ch. $6^{11, 12, 18}$. Also 1 Pet. 1^{5}, 2^{6f}, 5^{9}.

That faith is in a unique sense the condition of the new life in Christ, is implied in the conspicuous announcement, in Jno. 3^{15f}, that God gave His Son "in order that everyone who believes in Him may have eternal life." The same is repeated in chs. 5^{24}, $6^{40, 47}$, 11^{25f}, 20^{31}; 1 Jno. 5^{13}. In Jno. 7^{38f}, the fulness of the Christian life which brings abundant blessing to others is promised to him that believes in Christ; and is said to be wrought in them by the Spirit of God. That faith is the one work which God requires, is asserted in ch. 6^{29}: and this teaching is conspicuous throughout the Fourth Gospel and the First Ep. of John. It implies, and thus supports, the more detailed teaching of Paul.

Similarly, in the Synoptic Gospels, faith is conspicuous as a condition of blessing. So Mt. 9^{22}, "thy faith has saved thee;" also in *v.*^{29}, evidently stating a general principle, "according to your faith be it done to you." Also chs. 17^{20}, 21^{22}, Mk. 9^{23}. This agreement of these widely different types of N.T. teaching, taken in connection with the doctrine of pardon of sins through faith, already traced to Christ, is complete proof that He taught that salvation from beginning to completion is conditioned by faith. It has been abundantly verified in the experience of His followers. Since the New Life in Christ is a *holy* life (Rom. $6^{19, 22}$), this conspicuous element of the Gospel of Christ may be called SANCTIFICATION THROUGH FAITH.

289. Like Justifying Faith, Sanctifying Faith also has (cp. Gal. 2^{20}, 2 Tim. 1^{12}, Mk. 11^{22}) God and Christ for its PERSONAL OBJECT. In each department, saving faith is an assurance, resting on the word and power and love of God,

that He will fulfil to us His promise of salvation: and in this idea the mind of the believer is at rest. Cp. §§ 177, 179. But sanctifying faith differs from that which justifies in the specific word believed, *i.e.* in its OBJECT-MATTER. When we come to God for pardon, we grasp, and appropriate to ourselves, His promise of pardon for all who believe that promise, and the promise gives us a measure of rest. By faith we obtain pardon, and an assurance that God no longer frowns on us because of our past sins. But we know, or come to know, that Christ claims the unreserved loyalty, in action, word, and thought, of all whom God pardons. This unreserved devotion, we have not given, and for our failure and our lack of love we stood condemned till we ventured to believe that our condemnation was buried in the grave of Christ. But forgiveness for past unfaithfulness will not satisfy us. We need to be kept from falling and actually to yield to God the devotion He claims.

In view of this deeper need, Christ speaks to us again; and promises to work in us by His Spirit the devotion He requires, to give us full victory over all sin, and to fill our hearts with an all-controlling love to God. We dare not doubt His ability and purpose to save. Incredible as it may seem that we who have been so long led captive by sin should now triumph over all sin, even over the accumulated present power of our own past sins, and yield to God henceforth a whole-hearted service, it is easier to believe that God will enable us to do this than to suppose that His promise will fail. We therefore venture to believe that, what He has promised, He will also do, even in us. This reasonable expectation gives us rest: and thousands can bear witness that in proportion to their faith the promise of God is fulfilled in them. This inward rest in assured

expectation of a full salvation wrought in us by the power of the Spirit of God is SANCTIFYING FAITH.

290. All this by no means supersedes earnest and watchful STRUGGLE against sin and intense personal EFFORT to yield to Christ the devotion He claims: see § 313. Indeed, it is psychologically impossible to believe that God will save us from sin unless we resolutely set ourselves against it. Nor can we expect Christ to live in us a life of devotion to God unless we appropriate to ourselves the mind that was in Christ and lay upon the altar consecrated by His blood whatever we have and are. Thus, just as the faith which justifies is impossible, apart from repentance, so sanctifying faith is impossible apart from unreserved consecration of ourselves to God, which, as a new purpose, is itself akin to the repentance which precedes justification. Not unfrequently, reluctance to give to Christ the devotion He claims, *i.e.* to use for Him and under His direction our various powers, has paralysed faith and left men in spiritual weakness. On the other hand, unreserved surrender to God not supplemented by faith in the promise and power of God has often been followed by failure and disappointment, and sometimes by despair. For full rest in God and full realisation of the new life in Christ, we need first an earnest and all-embracing consecration, and then a full assurance that what we need God will work in us by His Spirit.

291. That faith is the ONE immediate CONDITION both of justification and of the whole Christian life, suggests a deep and far-reaching CONGRUITY between this unique condition and the benefits dependent on it. All real belief is a surrender of the whole man to be controlled by something or someone whom our intelligence recognises as worthy of confidence. Faith in God is confidence in One whom our highest intelligence accepts with complete satisfaction as

worthy of all confidence. We need not wonder that such rest in God is the one condition of the effective operation in man of those divine influences which raise him from bondage to sin into a life of intelligent devotion to God. Faith in God is the normal attitude of an intelligent creature to whom his Creator has spoken good tidings of salvation and blessing.

Sanctifying faith differs from justifying faith in that the former is at once and in increasing measure VERIFIED by ACTUAL EXPERIENCE. Justification is the smile of a pardoning God replacing, for the justified, His righteous anger against sin: and, that God smiles on them, the justified know at first only by faith. But the new life in Christ is matter of direct experience. They who possess it are conscious of a Hand from above raising them, and breaking their previous bondage to sin: and they feel in their hearts the pulsations of a new life. They are conscious of aims and efforts which their moral sense approves. This new and self-attested life is a complete verification of the faith with which in their felt moral weakness they ventured to expect it; and of the earlier faith with which they accepted the Gospel promise of forgiveness. For, that they have now power to do right in a measure unknown before, is complete proof that their past sins are forgiven. Thus sanctifying faith and its results both supplement and verify the faith which justifies: cp. 2 Cor. 1^{12}.

292. The THREE ELEMENTS discussed in chs. 33, 34, viz. (1) unreserved loyalty to Christ, (2) breathed into man by the Holy Spirit, (3) on condition of man's faith, are in their nature inseparably connected. For, through man's inborn bondage to sin, God's purpose that we live for Him cannot be attained unless by His power He works in us the devotion He claims. Moreover, if this devotion is to be in any real sense our own, God's work in us must be conditional on our free surrender to Him: and, of this surrender, faith

is the simplest form. Thus the Holy Spirit is the link connecting faith with the new life. For faith has not in itself power to save: but, to those who believe, God gives, in sovereign mercy, the divine Bearer of the power and life of God. To know this, greatly helps our faith. For we dare not doubt that the Spirit thus given is able to impart even to us the devotion which God claims.

The above doctrine of Sanctification through Faith changes completely the whole aspect of the Christian life. It becomes now an effort to understand the will of God, and to believe that what He demands He will Himself work in us. This new aspect greatly increases our obligation to give to God that which He claims: for we can no longer plead the excuse of inability. On the other hand, it brings within our reach a completeness of devotion to God otherwise impossible and inconceivable. Henceforth we wait in confidence and joy to see in our own experience the wonderful works of God.

Thus is the new life in Christ altogether a work of God in man, conditioned by his faith, and therefore contingent on his acceptance of this great gift. See further in § 351f.

CHAPTER XXXV

IN CHRIST, ALL THINGS ARE NEW

293. WE saw in § 279 that, of the new life, of its every thought, purpose, and effort, Christ and His Kingdom are the one definite AIM: consequently, the new life is (1) FOR CHRIST. It is also (2) THROUGH CHRIST: so 1 Cor. 8^{6}, 2 Cor. 5^{18}, Rom. $5^{1, 2, 10, 11, 12-21}$, where this phrase is a dominant

note, chs. $1^{5, 8}$, 2^{16}, 7^{4}, 15^{30}, 16^{27}: similarly Col. 1^{20}, Eph. 1^{5}, 2^{18}, Ph. 1^{11}, 1 Th. 5^{9}, Tit. 3^{5}, etc. Also Heb. 1^{2}, 2^{10}, 7^{25}, $13^{15, 21}$; Jno. $1^{3, 10, 17}$, 3^{17}, 14^{6}, 1 Jno. 4^{9}; 1 Pet. 1^{21}, 2^{5}. This frequent phrase denotes a far-reaching relation between Christ and the works and acts of God. He is not the *First Cause*: for all things are "from God:" 1 Cor. 8^{6}, 2 Cor. 5^{18}. But He is the avenue or medium, *i.e.* the AGENT, through whom God works out His purposes. Cp. 1 Tim. 2^{5}, Heb. 9^{15}. That the Son holds a similar relation to the universe and to the Kingdom of God, reveals their common source and essential unity.

294. Just as the Creator (Gen. 1^{26}) is Himself the eternal archetype of His intelligent creatures, so the incarnate Son is the PATTERN of those whom through Him God reconciles to Himself: they are to be (3) LIKE CHRIST. So 1 Cor. 11^{1}, 2 Cor. 8^{9}, Ph. 2^{4-8}, Rom. 6^{11}, "*in like manner* reckon yourselves, etc.:" cp. Rom. 8^{29}, Ph. 3^{21}, each referring to the future splendour of the children of God. That, even in His birth as man, and in His suffering and death, Christ is our pattern, we read in 2 Cor. 8^{9}, Ph. 2^{6}, 1 Pet. 2^{21-24}; so chs. 3^{17f}, 4^{1}. Cp. Jno. 13^{15}, $15^{10, 12}$, 1 Jno. 2^{6}: so Mt. 11^{29}. In other words, the elements in Christ chiefly held up for our imitation are those which at first sight seem to be most completely beyond us, viz. His incarnation and His death. These are set before us, not for literal imitation, which is impossible, but because in them most conspicuously was manifested that "mind of Christ" which must be in us.

295. Very conspicuous and remarkable is the phrase (4) IN CHRIST, common in somewhat different forms to Paul and John, but found very rarely (1 Pet. 5^{14}, cp. Jude [1]) elsewhere in the N.T. Evidently it embodies a conception which moulded the thought of the two great N.T. theologians. See Rom. 3^{24}, $6^{11, 23}$, $8^{1, 2, 39}$; 1 Cor. $1^{2, 30}$, 3^{1}, 4^{17}; 2 Cor. $5^{17, 19}$;

Eph. $1^{1\text{-}12}$, $2^{6\text{-}21}$, etc. This phrase has a counterpart in the teaching that Christ dwells and lives *in* His people: so Rom. 8^{10}, "if Christ be in you," evidently equivalent to "if the Spirit of God dwells in you" in *vv.*$^{9,\ 11}$; Gal. 2^{20}, Eph. 3^{17}, Col. 1^{27}. Similar words are traced to the lips of Christ in Jno. 6^{56}, $15^{1\text{-}8}$, 16^{33}; a slightly changed phrase in ch. $15^{9,\ 10}$. Very important, as shedding light on the mysterious relation of the Father to the Son, and on that of God to man, is ch. $17^{21\text{-}23}$. Notice also 1 Jno. $2^{6,\ 24}$, 3^{6}. As with Paul, Christ abides in those who abide in Him: so Jno. $15^{4,\ 5}$, 1 Jno. 3^{24}, $4^{4,\ 12\text{-}16}$.

This language represents Christ as not only the *aim* and *agent* and *pattern* of the new life but also its ENVIRONMENT, as the home and refuge and vital atmosphere of whatever His servants think and speak and do. He is on every side of them; and in Him they rest. It also represents Christ as the animating principle moving them from within, and breathing into them a new life. These two aspects of relation to Christ are inseparable. For the new life raises us into a new environment: or, rather it becomes itself a new environment transforming all around us.

The above relation of believers to Christ is in Jno. 14^{20}, 17^{21} traced to an essential relation of the Son to the Father. Each of these divine Persons is to the other both centre and circumference: and this relation is the pattern of the mutual relation of Christ and His servants. Thus they who abide in Christ abide also in God. Of this mutual indwelling, the Spirit is the immediate agent: cp. Rom. 8^{9f}. For He is the divine Person who comes into immediate inward contact with the spirit of man; and thus the One Administrator of the entire work of God in Christ.

296. Since Christ is a Person distinct from us, He is to those who dwell in Him (5) a divine COMPANION, and they

are sharers WITH HIM of all that He has and is. So Rom. 8^{17}, where notice words compounded with *συν-*: *joint*-heirs, *jointly* suffer, *jointly*-glorified. Same composition in Eph. 2^{5f}: made-alive-*together*, raised-*together*, seated-*together*. Also Col. 2^{12f}, $3^{1.3}$, 2 Tim. 2^{12}. Similarly Jno. 17^{24}, Rev. 3^{21}, Mt. 19^{28}.

297. In the letters of Paul, this teaching receives an important further development, viz. that the great HISTORICAL EVENTS which closed the life of Christ on earth are REPRODUCED in the SPIRITUAL experience of His followers; that they are *crucified*, *dead*, *buried*, *made alive*, *raised*, and *enthroned* with Him. So Gal. 2^{19f}, 5^{24}, 6^{14}, Rom. $6^{2.11}$, 7^{4}, Col. $2^{11f.20}$, 3^{1}, 2 Tim. 2^{12}. A slightly different conception in Col 2^{13}, Eph. $2^{5.6}$; where some who were *dead* by reason of their own sins have been *made-alive-with* Christ. All this implies that the servants of Christ have passed, or will pass, through an experience analogous to the various steps by which He passed from human life on earth to the throne of God. It implies also that their inward spiritual experience is a result of His outward and historical experiences; that, through His escape centuries ago, by His own death, from the curse and burden of our sin they are to-day conquerors of sin, and that through His resurrection they already live a new and deathless life. The life which then entered into His sacred corpse has, in consequence of their inward contact with the Risen One, entered into them and become in them the breath of immortality. And the assurance that, in consequence of what Christ has already done and suffered, they will some day reign with Him in endless life, is to them, in the anticipation of faith, a present participation in that glory. This teaching, peculiar to Paul, deserves an attention it has not yet received.

298. All this reveals the deep impression in the mind and thought of Paul, made by the DEATH and RESURRECTION

of Christ, an impression which can be accounted for only by the historic reality of the latter event. It thus confirms the argument in ch. 27. It also greatly helps our faith. As we look back to Christ's death on the cross, and remember that in that moment He escaped completely from the enemies to whose fury He had for our sakes exposed Himself, we venture to believe that we are sharers in that deliverance, that by His cross we have ourselves escaped from the dominion of sin; and we also venture to believe that by faith and in Christ we already share the triumph of our Risen Lord. Henceforth His cross stands between us and our sins: and through His empty grave we enter a life of victory.

Thus is Christ, the eternal Son of God, who became Son of Man and died on the cross and rose to heaven, the Beginning and the End, the Centre and Circumference, of the new life given by God to His adopted sons. He through whose agency and for whose glory the universe was created is also the Agent and the Aim of this new life; its Pattern, its animating Principle, and its living Environment. The entrance of this new life into the hearts of its happy possessors involved a change so wonderful that it can be compared only to the death by which Christ escaped from His human and spiritual foes, to His resurrection from the dead and His ascension to heaven. It thus makes them, in close fellowship with Him, sharers of all that He has and is.

This conception of life, inspired and dominated by one human and superhuman Personality, is unique in human thought. Others have founded religions, and some of these last have continued to our day. But no one has gained for himself and for the events of his life, in the minds of even his most devoted followers, a place which can for a

moment be compared to the place which throughout the Christian centuries Jesus has held in the hearts and lives of unnumbered thousands, of whose whole thought He is the beginning and the end.

299. The precise meaning of the phrase DEAD TO SIN in Rom. $6^{2,\ 11}$ demands further attention. It can mean no less than complete deliverance: for death is absolute separation, an infinite gulf between the dead and the things amid which they once lived. That Christ *died to sin* (*v.*^{10}) can only mean that when He breathed out His life on the cross He thereby escaped completely from Annas and Caiaphas, the Roman soldiers, and those powers of darkness to whose assault He exposed Himself in order to save us. A similar deliverance (οὕτως) Paul bids his readers appropriate by the reckoning of faith. So *v.*^{22}, "made free from sin." So also "cleanse from all defilement" in 2 Cor. 7^{1}, 1 Jno. $1^{7,\ 9}$, where the aorist denotes a cleansing already attained; Acts 15^{9}, Heb. 9^{14}: similarly Tit. 2^{14}, 1 Pet. 1^{5}.

This language does not necessarily imply ANNIHILATION OF inherited TENDENCIES to evil or of the influence of formed habits of sin: for these do not defile us unless yielded to. Consequently, a felt tendency to evil, trampled under foot by the power of God, is not inconsistent with the purity described above. So Christ, though dead to sin, is ever carrying on war against it. This distinction is of utmost importance. For many who have ventured to accept the full salvation promised in the Gospel have been disappointed to find old tendencies, perhaps after a period of apparent quiescence, again asserting themselves and thus occasioning fresh conflict with a foe supposed to be dead. The disappointment is needless. If we abide in faith, and thus abide in God, each temptation will be followed by

victory: and each victory will weaken the power of our adversary, and reveal the impregnability of the fortress in which we have taken refuge.

300. Sinful HABITS can be eradicated only as they have been formed, viz. by a course of contrary action. God will both rescue us from, and destroy, these formed habits, in thought, word, or act, by giving us successive and constant victory over them. The man who has been a slave to alcohol will not at once lose his appetite for it. But he will receive power to control, and each victory will weaken, his appetite, even though it remains as a danger demanding constant watchfulness. This gradual weakening seems to be referred to in Rom. 8^{13}: "ye are putting to death the actions of the body." Cp. Gal. 5^{16f}: "for the flesh desires (ἐπιθυμεῖ) against the Spirit, and the Spirit (desires) against the flesh: for these are hostile, each to the other, in order that, whatever things ye wish, these ye may not do." Here is no word of blame, but simply a statement of fact. We may therefore take it as describing the normal state of the adopted sons of God. Two mutually hostile influences seek to direct their action, viz. the bodily life which they share with animals, and the Spirit of God. This suggests or implies a continuance of inborn influences opposed to God.

301. The above teaching puts within reach, even of the most defiled, a PURIFICATION otherwise impossible and inconceivable. For we cannot doubt the promise or the power of Christ. We therefore go each day into conflict even against the accumulated power of our own past sins, and in spite of our felt moral weakness, with a shout of victory. For we know that the fight is fought not by our weakness but by the infinite power of the Holy Spirit dwelling in our hearts and guarding us from all evil. To thou-

sands, this discovery has been an era in their spiritual life. Probably each day as they review it they are ready to admit that through defective faith it has been marked by sinful imperfection. Many will admit that sometimes, through unwatchfulness rather than through stress of temptation, their faith has so far failed that they have tolerated sin in their hearts. But they have gone back to the cleansing fountain; and in view of much imperfection they thankfully acknowledge that by the grace of God they have lived a life of victory unknown to them till they ventured to trust the keeping of their wayward hearts to the great Shepherd: cp. 2 Cor. 1^{12}.

302. In 1 Jno. $3^{6,9}$ we read that "everyone that abides in Him does no sin: everyone that sins has not seen Him, neither knows Him . . . . everyone born from God does no sin . . . and cannot sin." Probably the word *sin* here denotes actual transgression; as in Jas. 1^{15}, where it is distinguished from *desire*. The Greek *perfect* asserts that they who are committing sin either have not seen the heavenly light or have lost the effect of the vision.

303. In what sense is the believer (Rom. 7^{4}, Gal. 2^{19}) dead "to THE LAW" and "to law?" The word cannot be limited to the ceremonial *law*: for in Rom. 7^{7f} it includes conspicuously the tenth commandment. Moreover the moral law is a far more terrible barrier to the favour of God than are any mere ordinances of ritual. For it touches the springs of action much more closely, and reveals our moral powerlessness much more clearly, than do these, and makes a far stronger appeal to the moral sense. We may perform a rite correctly: but none can so love God and love his neighbour as to claim on this ground the favour of God. If there be any law from which we need deliverance, it is from the

condemnation pronounced on every man by these two great commandments.

304. Rom. 8^{3f} implies clearly that OBEDIENCE to the Law is a part of the purpose of the incarnation of the Son of God: so ch. 13^{8-10} implies that in some real sense the Law is still valid as a rule of conduct. Similarly, the lists of sins in Gal. 5^{19-21} imply that the broad principles of morality, so frequently enforced in the O.T. as binding on Israel and on the world, are still binding under the New Covenant, and that obedience to them is an absolute condition of entrance into the glory announced by Christ. The N.T. from beginning to end inculcates obedience to the moral law as a condition of the favour of God.

305. In Rom. 7^{1-4} Paul illustrates our relation to the Law by reminding us that a MARRIED WOMAN is, while her husband lives, prevented by "the law" from marrying another man. The Law seems to rivet the chains of what may be degrading bondage, and to be an absolute barrier to a union which may be for her highest good. But the husband dies: and now all is changed. The hand of death has broken down the insuperable barrier, and the woman is free. In this sense, she is *dead to the law*. Paul says that in a similar sense they who put faith in Christ have escaped from the law which formerly condemned them. They are dead to the law in the sense that, through the death of Christ, they are no longer condemned by it to separation from God and to the consequent bondage under the yoke of sin.

On the other hand, the Law is an expression of the abiding will of God touching the conduct of all His intelligent creatures. It is therefore to us an authoritative guide in action: and only as we obey it can we enjoy His favour. In this sense (1 Cor. $^{20, 21}$) Paul is "not himself *under law*,"

yet "not without law of God but *in law* of Christ." The change from ὑπὸ νόμον which he denies, to ἔννομος which he asserts, suggests that the Law is no longer a burden *under* which he lies in bondage, but a vital element *in* which he lives. This conspicuous and important change of prepositions, the R.V. overlooks.

This changed relation is brought about by the gift of the SPIRIT. For the "Law is *spiritual*," it is "the Law of the Spirit of life:" Rom. 7^{14}, 8^{2}. Dwelling in the sons of God, the Spirit reveals to them the excellence of that which the Law commands, and thus makes them eager to do it. And, more wonderful still, He gives them power to do what He has taught them to desire.

306. This gift of the SPIRIT on condition of FAITH changes the whole aspect of THE LAW. It is still a voice of God speaking with an authority which none can contradict. But formerly we were unable to obey it: and it pronounced our condemnation, and thus became an intolerable burden. But we have now learnt that whatever God commands He works in those who venture in faith to expect Him so to do; that He will Himself lead them, and enable them to walk, along the path marked out by the written law. So complete is this change that it can be described only by saying that the believer is dead to the Law. Thus, in the grave of Christ, the Law, as Paul the Pharisee once knew it, has been buried: and from that grave with the rising Lord it has risen to be the light and joy of His people. A foretaste of this change finds voice in Ps. $119^{97, 105}$: cp. Jas. 2^{8-12}.

This deep HARMONY between the law written (Rom. 2^{14f}) in the hearts of all men and in the sacred literature of ancient Israel, and the Gospel of Christ, is a decisive confirmation of other evidence proving this last to be from God. Manifestly the Gospel makes for righteousness. For

it liberates us from hopeless moral bondage, affords a strong motive for obeying the moral law, and gives power to obey it. This wonderful homage paid by the Gospel to the moral law so deeply interwoven into the highest element in human nature, is complete proof that the Gospel comes from the intelligent and righteous Creator and Ruler of men.

307. We now consider the relation of the new life to its ENVIRONMENT. This is the more needful because at first sight, even to the best men, their environment seems sometimes to be hostile. And in the world around, from some points of view, confusion seems to reign. We shall find that under apparent discord lies deep and far-reaching harmony.

Man is, or seems to be, to a large extent, AT THE MERCY of men and things around. Our bodily constitution, needing food, makes us dependent on natural forces beyond our control or foresight; and thus makes life to many a toil and weariness and anxiety. Moreover, all are liable to accident and sickness; and are under the doom of bodily death. All this is greatly aggravated by men around us. For these, if hostile, may inflict loss and pain and death. This dependence on others complicates greatly the problems of life. On all sides, man is hemmed in by his environment, material and human.

It also tends to DEGRADE. The effort to maintain ourselves and those dependent on us absorbs both time and energy, and thus hinders the self-culture which would raise us to a higher level. Not unfrequently, under pressure of hunger, men have sunk into crime and deep moral degradation. To them, the necessities of animal life have debased all that gives to human life its distinctive worth. Moreover, man's dependence on his fellows, frequently on bad men, tempts him to seek their favour by doing that which his better

judgment disapproves, thus making him in some sense their slave.

308. We notice, however, that in Christian nations much is done to RESCUE men from a hostile environment. Facilities for communication have made famine in the more developed states impossible, and in all Christian states less likely and less terrible. The medical art has done much to lessen suffering: and the mutual care of man for man protects in increasing measure each individual. Man is conquering his surroundings, rescuing himself from their control, and making them subservient to his well-being. Much is being done, by good government, to rescue good men from the violence of the bad; and to unite the body politic, in its larger and smaller circles, in efforts for the general good, and thus for the good of each individual. All this encourages a hope that man's environment, material and social, so long a fetter holding him down, will become, to a degree far greater than hitherto, helpful to his pleasure and well-being.

309. We now ask, To what extent is man's relation to his environment directly AFFECTED by the NEW LIFE breathed by the Spirit of God into those who believe the Gospel? Paul's answer in Rom. 8^{28}, is that "to those who love God all things are working together for good." The words following suggest that this harmonious and beneficent working is an accomplishment of a divine and therefore eternal "purpose" embracing both man and his environment: and in *v.*[29] this purpose is further described: "foreordained to be conformed to the image of His Son." In other words, to those who love God, under apparent conflict and confusion is a beneficent PURPOSE and universal HARMONY. This is further illustrated, in *vv.*[31-39], by the song of triumph in which culminates Paul's exposition of the Gospel and of the new

life thus given to men. This glowing argument implies that the universe, including natural forces and bad men, is in God's hands, as part of His purpose of blessing; and therefore cannot hinder, but must help forward, that purpose.

Similar teaching is implied in Mt. $6^{24\text{-}34}$, Jno. 9^{3}, 11^{4}; Gen. 50^{12}. Cp. Plato's *Republic* bk. 10, p. 613*a*: "This must be our notion of the just man that, even when he is in poverty or sickness or any other seeming misfortune, to him these things will turn out in the end for good, living or even dead. For by the gods he is cared for, whoever he be, that eagerly wishes to become righteous and by practising virtue to become like God so far as this is possible to man." This quotation might be supplemented by many others from the best literature of the ancient world.

310. To the race as a whole many BENEFITS come from things unpleasant and painful and at first sight injurious. Man's conflict with nature for food and other necessaries has wonderfully stimulated industry and intelligence; and has thus been a fruitful source of progress; and has frequently developed the highest moral qualities. Men have submitted to toil and pain, and have dared danger, in order to provide for wives and children; and have thus themselves risen in moral worth. Even misery has evoked a pity and beneficence which have greatly enriched the benefactors. Unquestionably, the hardships of life have contributed immensely to the higher education of the race; and we cannot doubt that this benefit was part of the creative purpose of God. In this general sense, many influences apparently hostile "are working together for good."

311. Paul's statement in Rom. 8^{28} is LIMITED "to those that LOVE GOD:" benefit to others lay outside his thought. This limitation is easily understood. For, as we saw in § 280,

love is the normal relation of an intelligent creature to his Creator. He claims our love; and has manifested Himself in order that we may love Him. Where love to God is not, man's normal development, intellectual and moral, has been hindered. This implies resistance to God and discord. On the other hand, to those who have accepted this normal development, there is harmony with God, and therefore with all that God has made.

This teaching of Paul has been abundantly VERIFIED. Thousands of men and women have borne bravely and cheerfully the burdens of life: and their endurance has developed in them a nobility of spirit, a trust in God, and an experience of His all-sufficient grace, worth infinitely more than all they have endured. Even the malice of bad men, failing to evoke in them resentment and thus to do them the only real injury, has wrought in them patience and forbearance like that of Christ, and has thus been a means of spiritual gain. The pleasant things of life have not to them obscured the better things of the life to come, but have prompted gratitude to God: and wealth has been a means of advancing His Kingdom. Thus amid light and shadow, sunshine and storm, aided by both and by its entire environment, the new life in Christ makes progress.

This blessed experience is decisive proof that man's material ENVIRONMENT, near and remote, IS FROM GOD and is controlled by God. Thus the moral and spiritual benefits actually derived from our material surroundings are additional evidence that the universe is an offspring of an intelligent and righteous Creator. That MATTER aids the highest development of MIND, proves that it sprang from MIND. To know that the complicated tissue of forces and influences around, at whose mercy we seem to be, is from God as a part of His eternal purpose of mercy to us, and is working

out that purpose, is to be at peace amid the storms of life and under the shadow of death.

312. We now see that, to those who put faith in Christ and yield themselves to the transforming influence of His love, the world around is altogether changed; or rather its aspect is so changed that its practical influence is also changed. Once our environment, material and human, was our lord; upon the smile of our fellows and upon the chances of fortune seemed to hang our highest interests; and this felt dependence was sometimes a degrading bondage. NOW ALL IS CHANGED. We have seen the hand of a Father in heaven controlling and guiding the forces of nature and of the social life of men, forces so mighty and sometimes apparently so destructive; and we know that all these things are our servants for good. This discovery has broken the fetters in which we lay bound, and has made us free indeed: and it has come through the death and resurrection and Gospel of Christ. So Paul says in Gal. 6^{14}, pointing exultingly to a vanquished tyrant and to "the cross" on which Christ died, "through which to me the world is crucified, and I to the world;" and in 2 Cor. 5^{17}, "if anyone be in Christ, he is a new creature: the old things have gone by, behold they have become new."

Thus the new life, by putting us right with God, has put us right with all else. To the unsaved, within and around were discord, confusion, and ruin; each one pursuing his own selfish aim, and therefore different aims, and thus coming into collision each against others. But they who, led by the Spirit, have felt the magic power of the manifested love of Christ and have thus been drawn to Him by loyal devotion, have by their loyalty to the one Lord been united, each to others, in HARMONIOUS CO-OPERATION. Although surrounded by influences tending to SIN, influences strengthened by

their own past indulgence in sin, they are, while they lean upon the strong arm of God, preserved from sin by the power of the Spirit dwelling in their hearts. THE LAW, which they once deliberately or carelessly broke, or painfully and vainly endeavoured to keep while it condemned them for past disobedience, has now become a lamp to their feet and a song in the house of their pilgrimage. For the Spirit who wrote that law in the moral sense of all men, and guided the writers of the Sacred Books of Israel, dwells in their hearts as the animating principle of a new life: and the UNIVERSE around, under whose tyranny they once trembled, is now seen to be to them a minister of God for good.

CHAPTER XXXVI

CONFLICT AND GROWTH

313. IN ch. 33 we saw that the new life is one of intelligent activity in the service of Christ. We shall now see that this loyal activity involves the intense effort of personal spiritual CONFLICT. So Lk. 13^{24}: "*strive* (ἀγωνίζεσθε *agonize*, as an athlete against an antagonist) to enter in through the narrow door: because many will seek to enter in but will not have strength." Also Ph. 2^{12}, which suggests anxious care, as in a matter serious and difficult. This element of Paul's teaching is often embodied in a favourite metaphor taken from the Greek athletic contests, and suggested above in Lk. 13^{24}. So 1 Cor. $9^{23\text{-}27}$, where he and his readers are athletes contending for a *crown* or garland: and he reminds them that every athlete is "in all things self-controlled,"

i.e. subordinates everything to the prize he has in view. This refers probably to the severe regimen of the ten months' preparatory training. Paul finds an adversary in his own "body," which he leads about like a slave lest even he, a herald, be rejected as unworthy of the prize. In Ph. $3^{12\text{-}14}$, we have a picture of a racer pressing forward, forgetting all else, to the goal. In 1 Tim. 6^{12}, Paul teaches that "eternal life" can be obtained only as an athlete gains a prize, viz. by personal conflict and victory. In 2 Tim. 4^{8} the conflict is over, and the garland won.

In the Greek contests, a chief factor was the antagonist or competitor: 1 Cor. 9^{24}. So, in Eph. 6^{12}, Paul reminds his readers that they "wrestle" against superhuman opponents; and, somewhat changing the metaphor from the athlete to the soldier, urges them to "put on the whole armour of God." This military metaphor meets us again in 2 Tim. 2^{3f}. The change emphasizes the element common to the two metaphors, viz. intense effort against a terrible antagonist.

The Christian race is mentioned in Heb. 12^{1}: the antagonist appears again 1 Pet. 5^{8f}. The same idea of conflict finds expression in the word *overcome* in 1 Jno. 2^{13f}, 5^{4f}; Rev. $2^{7, 11, 17, 26}$, $3^{5, 12, 21}$, also 12^{11}, 15^{2}, 21^{7}. A stronger form of the same word is found in Rom. 8^{37}, *more-than-overcome*: and a cognate word, *victory*, in 1 Cor. 15^{57}. Thus, in various types of N.T. teaching, the new life is depicted as strenuous effort evoked by conflict against tremendous antagonists.

This picture is confirmed by experience. In our efforts to do right and to win others for Christ, we meet resistance from our environment, from our fellows, and in our own hearts. Moralists in all ages have depicted the path of righteousness as beset by foes: and still more terrible opposition has stood in the path of those who have tried to win the world for Christ. The severity of the opposition sug-

gests irresistibly that it is supported by superhuman enemies of God and man.

314. In this conflict, the servants of Christ have SUPERHUMAN HELP: so 1 Jno. 4^4, 1 Cor. 15^{57}, Rom. 8^{37}. The two factors are put side by side in Ph. 2^{12f}, also Col. 1^{29} where notice the word *agonize* as in 1 Tim. 6^{12}, Lk. 13^{24}. The victory is through the death of Christ and through faith: Rev. 12^{11}; 1 Jno. 5^{4f}, Eph. 6^{16}. This teaching puts a new face on the Christian conflict: just as in Christ our relation to sin, to the Law, to the world, is changed. The unavailing revolt in Rom. 7^{23} has given place to the shout of victory in v^{25}. In Christ, the conflict has become a march of triumph.

These two aspects of the Christian life must ever be kept in view. We are in an enemy's country: around us, and in our own wayward hearts, foes lie in ambush ready to ensnare and destroy us. We therefore need constant watchfulness: but we watch as for conquered and powerless foes. For, from another point of view, the battle is over. It was finished when the Conqueror returned to His home on high. We therefore day by day go down into the conflict against enemies far mightier than ourselves with perfect confidence: for (1 Pet. 1^5) we are "guarded in God's power." The question is, not whether we can conquer by our own moral strength, but whether we venture to accept the promise of victory. Then are we more than conquerors.

This victory, given by Christ (1 Cor. 15^{57}) to those who put faith in Him, fills them, even in the midst of conflict, with profound PEACE. We are at peace because under us are the eternal arms. This "peace of God" (Ph. 4^7) is not only His gift but an overflow of the eternal calm which fills His own breast. It therefore "passes all understanding," of those who observe, and of those who experience it, for

it is often found where least expected. And it *guards* the "heart," the source of purpose and action, and the "mind," often a haunt of troubled or sinful thoughts: for it keeps us safe from spiritual dangers into which others fall. This rest "in Christ" is the beginning and the pledge of eternal rest, the dawn of the eternal day.

315. The SECRET of this peace, in his dungeon at Rome and under shadow of the gallows, Paul tells us in *vv.*[11-13]. He has "learnt to be self-sufficient:" αὐτάρκης. For he abides in Christ who says (2 Cor. 12^9) "*sufficient* for thee is My grace." This inward sufficiency teaches him how to descend into poverty, hardship, suffering, or the grave, in each case without loss; and how to climb safely the perilous heights of prosperity and fame: "I know how to be abased, etc." In what school this wonderful lesson was "learnt," we infer (Ph. 4^{12}) from the word μεμύημαι *I-have-been-initiated-into-the-mystery*, a technical term for the Greek MYSTERIES, of which those at Eleusis are the best known, at which in the darkness of the night the μύσται (*mystics*) were taken into the secret chamber of the goddess, and heard secrets not otherwise to be known. That there are such secrets in the Gospel, known only by those whose hearts and minds He opens, Christ asserts in Mt. 13^{11}, Mk. 4^{11}, Lk. 8^{10}. All this took firm hold of the thought of Paul; and suggested his use of the word *mystery* in Rom. 16^{25}, 1 Cor. 2^7, Eph, $3^{3,9}$, etc., and Ph. 4^{11-13}.

These secrets or *mysteries* are those PROFOUNDER VIEWS of God, of His love to man and His ways with men, of Christ and His salvation, which in all ages have been the blessed privilege of those who dwell in His nearer presence and look most deeply into His mind and purpose. This is the beatific vision of Christian life on earth. It eludes the keenest glance of mere intellect. None see it except those whom God takes

by the hand and leads, often amid darkness and storms, along a path known only by Himself, to the secret place in which He reveals to those who closely follow Him a light not seen by others. They who have learnt this lesson (Ph. 4^{13}) have "strength for all things in Him who gives them power."

This light shines upon men through teaching which can be traced, by decisive documentary evidence, through the writings of His immediate followers, to the lips of Christ. For this objective documentary evidence, interpreted by the best scholarship, is a needful standard by which to distinguish eternal truth from the vagaries of our own imagination. But mere scholarship can never learn the deeper truths of the Gospel. To reveal these, usually through the avenue of scholarship, is the prerogative of the Holy Spirit. In the alliance of exact and broad scholarship with spiritual light, we have the true place and sufficient safeguard of Christian mysticism.

Thus (Eph. 6^{10}) Christ arms His servants for the Christian conflict, and (1 Cor. 15^{57}) gives them victory.

316. In the midst of conflict Paul looks forward with joyful confidence to final victory: Rom. 5^{2}, $8^{18, 38, 39}$; Ph. 1^{6}, 2 Tim. 4^{18}, etc. Now we saw in §§ 283–286 that salvation is, from the first turning to God till final victory, altogether a work of God in man; and in § 287 that it is obtained by faith, *i.e.* by self-surrender to divine influences leading up to repentance and faith. That this self-surrender is not a result of irresistible influences, but is ultimately conditioned only by man's free choice, is implied in many warnings throughout the Bible: see § 351.

317. In Rom. 11^{20-23}, Paul teaches that some olive twigs were BROKEN OFF because of their unbelief, and that his readers stand by faith. He warns them that He who did not spare the natural branches will not spare them unless they

continue in His kindness; and adds that if the unbelievers forsake their unbelief God will restore them. Now Paul's unbelieving countrymen were certainly in peril of final ruin: for no less peril would prompt Paul, in ch. 9^3, almost to wish himself, on their behalf, separated from Christ. And their fall is held up to his readers as a warning of what will befall them if they do not continue in faith. Yet the Roman Christians are assumed to have actual spiritual life: chs. 5^{10}, 8^{16}. Otherwise they would perish whether they continue or not. The whole warning implies that the readers' final salvation depends upon their maintaining their present spiritual position; and that it is possible for them to fall from it and perish. In 1 Cor. $9^{23\text{-}27}$, Paul writes that he uses all means to save all he can in order to be himself a sharer, with his converts, in the blessings of the Gospel. His readers and himself are athletes contending for a prize; and he fears lest, after having preached to others, he may be himself rejected. This warning, he supports in ch. $10^{1\text{-}12}$ by the example of ancient Israel, of whom all passed the Red Sea but very few entered the promised land. Upon this, he bases a final warning, "let him that thinks that he stands beware lest he fall." This warning would have no meaning if the possession of genuine spiritual life necessarily insured final salvation.

So Jno. 15^6, from the lips of Christ. These "branches" must have actual spiritual life. For, not only has every dead branch once been living, but all is here made to depend upon continuing in their present state. Mere professors would perish whether they continue or not.

318. The above teaching is balanced by Jno. 10^{28}. The harmony is not far to seek: for Christ refers evidently to sheep of His own flock; and asserts that no hostile violence will tear them from Him. So in Rom. 8^{38}, Paul says that "neither death nor life . . . will be able to separate us from

the love of God." But nothing is said about the possibility of a sheep wandering away from the flock, and thus perishing. And in Rom. $11^{20\text{-}23}$, this danger is assumed to be real. Similarly, the terrible doom in Rev. 21^{8} against "all the liars" does not shut out hope that those once guilty of falsehood may turn from it and be saved.

319. Thus the new life in Christ, which is from beginning to end a work of God in man, is nevertheless altogether conditional, both in its beginning and its continuance, on man's faith. Consequently, it is an intermingling of confidence and salutory fear. We rest in Christ to-day, and know that no hostile power can force us from Him. But we know that if we were to leave our impregnable refuge, we should fall a prey to our adversaries. This real danger gives intense reality to the Christian conflict: for upon our faithfulness depends our final salvation.

320. A conspicuous feature of life in all its forms is GROWTH; at least up to a certain stage. The need for growth in the new life in Christ is implied in Paul's rebuke, in 1 Cor. 3^{1f}, that his readers are still "babes in Christ" unable to take solid food, and in ch. 14^{20}, where they are urged to "become *full-grown* (τέλειοι) in their minds." So Eph. $4^{14\text{-}16}$, where instead of the waywardness of children, Paul sets before them (αὔξησις) *growth* and (οἰκοδομή) *upbuilding*, terms conspicuously suggesting progress. Similarly, Heb. $5^{12\text{-}14}$. The promising converts described in 1 Th. 1^{3} needed (ch. 3^{10}) a full equipment (καταρτίσαι) of the deficiencies of their faith; for which in *v.*^{12} Paul prays. The Greek aorist in ch. 5^{23} (cp. same tense in 2 Cor. 7^{1}, Rom. 12^{1}) suggests a definite stage of progress: and in 2 Th. 1^{3} we have continued progress. The need for progress is implied in Rom. 1^{11}, Ph. $1^{6\text{-}11}$. In ch. 3^{12} we have a graphic picture of Paul's own

progress, implying that sustained progress attained by intense and continued effort is the normal condition of the servants of Christ. In Eph. $1^{17\text{-}19}$, $3^{14\text{-}19}$ we have sublime prayers indicating steps upward in this needed development. In 1 Jno. $2^{12\text{-}14}$, we have three successive grades in the Christian life.

321. All this we can understand. In many cases, the faith which appropriates justification is a slow growth. BY DEGREES men venture to accept, and apply to themselves, and appropriate, the great truth that God receives into His favour all who put faith in Christ, and that therefore He now receives them. In other cases, the light streams in almost at once. But probably in each case there has been a gradual preparation for this sudden illumination. Still more gradual, usually, is the apprehension and approbation and realisation of the more wonderful truth that God, who claims the unreserved devotion of all His servants, works in them by His Spirit and by inward contact with Christ, here and now, in a very real measure, the devotion He claims. But, be this truth ever so fully and firmly grasped, it leaves room for, and demands, a continuous and progressive further apprehension. Yet, whenever and however grasped, its apprehension creates a definite stage of spiritual growth.

Increasing faith reveals with increasing clearness the love manifested in the death of Christ, and thus evokes increasing love to Him who first loved us. The love thus revealed will be enriched with increasing perception of moral distinctions and of God's purposes for man: for faith is the hand which takes hold of all the revelations of God. This growing faith and intelligence and love will change and raise our whole nature; and unite us in closer fellowship with Christ.

322. The Four Gospels add little directly to the above teaching. Christ taught the rudimentary principles of the

Gospel, to men in whom, before (Jno. 7^{39}) the gift of the Holy Spirit, that life was necessarily very immature. But His teaching involves and suggests growth. Further teaching was left, as need should arise, to the Spirit whom the departing Son promised to His disciples. The Bk. of Acts narrates the founding of the various Churches, but says little about the progressive development of individuals. This was for the more part left to the great apostle who cared for his many converts as a father for the education of his children; and who, while dealing with the many details of actual church life, gives incidentally most important teaching about the spiritual growth of the servants of Christ. His letters imply throughout that the new life is conflict, perseverance, and growth.

CHAPTER XXXVII

THE MEANS OF GRACE. PRAYER

323. WE come now to consider certain special channels appointed by God to be the ORDINARY AVENUES through which this new life is received and sustained and developed.

In §§ 181, 287f, we saw that faith is a condition of all the benefits announced in the Gospel. But, without a spoken word of God brought to our ears and intelligence, there cannot be faith in God: so Rom. 10^{14}. Chief therefore among the means of grace must be an announcement of the GOOD NEWS of salvation: so Mk. 16^{15}, 1 Cor. $1^{18, 21, 23}$, Rom. 1^{16}. Since the Gospel is many-sided, its intelligent reception requires, not only proclamation, but continued TEACHING to widen and

deepen the impression made by the first announcement: so Mt. 28^{20}, Acts 13^{1}, 1 Cor. 12^{28}, Eph. 4^{11}. In Col. 1^{28} consecutive teaching is spoken of as a means of Christian maturity.

Since the truth revealed under the Old Covenant and that revealed in Christ have permanent embodiment in O.T. and N.T., careful study of THE BIBLE has ever been a rich nourishment of the spiritual life. Through the silent page, God speaks to the devout student, and through the written word His power works in us, enriching and strengthening. We thus sit at the feet, not only of the apostles, but of Christ. In the sacred records, God has given us an all-important means of grace.

Other conspicuous means of grace are the two rites ordained by Christ for all His servants, BAPTISM and the LORD'S SUPPER, which, as visible embodiments of important Gospel truth, we may speak of as symbolic words: see chs. 47, 49f.

324. In nearly all religions, and conspicuously in O.T. and N.T., PRAYER is offered to an unseen Helper. Its wide prevalence bears witness to man's deep sense of dependence on a superhuman power thus accessible to man.

As examples, I quote Ex. $32^{11\text{-}14}$, 33^{23}, where Moses pleads for Israel when guilty of a great sin, and in answer to his prayer the nation is spared; and Isa. $37^{14\text{-}35}$, where, in great national peril, Hezekiah appeals to God for help, and his prayer is answered. The Bk. of Psalms contains many examples of earnest petition and supplication which have been most helpful in all ages to the prayers even of the servants of Christ.

The incarnate Son spent in prayer the night before the appointment of the twelve apostles: Lk. 6^{12}. In Mk. 14^{36} we have a pathetic example of prayer for deliverance from

impending and overwhelming agony: and in Jno. $17^{11\text{-}23}$, Lk. 22^{32}, Christ prays for His disciples. In Mt. 7^{7}, He gives His broad sanction to prayer, and supports it by comparing our "Father in heaven" to human parents who, when asked, give good things to their children: similarly, Lk. 11^{13}. To the disciples asking Him to teach them to pray, Christ gave a shorter version of a FORM OF PRAYER already embodied in the Sermon on the Mount: Lk. 11^{2}, Mt. $6^{9\text{-}13}$. The close verbal similarity of these forms reveals their firm place in the memory of His earliest followers. On the eve of His betrayal, Christ gave great promises of answer to prayer: Jno. 14^{13f}, 15^{7}, 16^{24}. A marked feature of Paul's epistles is his eager desire for prayer on his behalf. So 2 Th. 3^{1f}, 2 Cor. 1^{1f}, Rom. 15^{30f}; similarly Col. 4^{12}, Eph. 6^{19f}, Col. 4^{3f}, also Rom. 1^{9f}, Ph. 1^{9}. Sublime specimens of prayer, in Eph. $1^{16\text{-}23}$, $3^{14\text{-}19}$. The above passages, and many others similar, leave no room for doubt that Christ, by example and precept, following earlier teachers, specially sanctioned prayer as a means of obtaining blessing from God. This is an assured historical result of our theological research.

325. That Christ sanctioned prayer, implies that GOD DESIGNS men to ASK for, and thus obtain, blessing from Him: and this implies that, by His ordinance, there are blessings to be obtained not otherwise than by prayer. We reverently ask, WHY HAS GOD ORDAINED PRAYER as a means of grace? Not in order to acquaint Him with our needs. For these, known very imperfectly to us, are altogether known to God. Nor to persuade Him to bless, as man pleads with man for some benefit which the other is reluctant to give. Our question remains, Why does God give, to those who ask, blessings which He does not give to others?

A partial answer is suggested by Christ's comparison of our Father in heaven to parents who give to children when they

ask. Sometimes a mother makes asking a condition of receiving in order, by this gentle compulsion, to TRAIN THE CHILD to speak and thus to evoke personal intercourse between parent and child. For the sake of the education involved in asking, good things which the child needs, and knows that he needs, are held back till asked for. Now it is matter of blessed experience that in prayer the children of God have intelligent intercourse with a Father in heaven. Thus by personal contact of spirit with Spirit, they obtain a consciousness, otherwise impossible, of the presence of an unseen yet personal Companion and Helper. In such moments of prayer, men have experienced the reality and nearness of God, sometimes in utter loneliness and helplessness, in a measure far more than compensating for the absence of all human companionship and help. This wonderful result points to a divine purpose. We cannot doubt that, in order to evoke this personal intercourse with God, and thus to give to man a fuller revelation of Himself, God ordained prayer as a means of grace.

Again, in the N.T. prayer is closely connected with FAITH, and faith is a condition of successful prayer: so Mk. 11^{23f}; Jas. 1^{5f}. This is in close harmony with the teaching of Paul and of Christ that the blessings of the New Covenant are obtained by faith. Now the promise that they who ask shall receive is a searching test of our faith. Many cannot believe that by merely asking they will receive, and, according to their unbelief, it is not done to them. Others venture to accept, as did Abraham, (Rom. 4^{21f},) the promise of God. They ask, confidently expecting to receive: and, what they expect, they obtain. Here again from the result we infer a divine purpose. God ordained prayer and Christ gave the promise to answer prayer, in order to test and thus develop our faith in God.

326. God will answer prayer only so far as it is in HARMONY with the PRINCIPLES of His administration of His kingdom: for these are for the highest good of man; and therefore to deviate from them would be injury to him. By these principles, consequently, are limited and must be interpreted, all the promises of God. To be effectual, therefore, prayer must be in harmony with the will of God. The great promise in Jno. 15^{7} is for those who "abide in Me:" and the prayers of such will be controlled by the new life derived from this inward union with Him. Similarly 1 Jno. $5^{14f.}$ Thus is effectual prayer conditioned by careful study of the mind and purpose of God.

327. The simplest form of prayer is for the SPIRITUAL BLESSINGS promised in the Gospel to all who put faith in Christ. For here two persons only are involved, ourselves and God; and we know that what we ask for is good. The only conditions are that we understand the will of God and expect, with humble yet confident faith, its accomplishment in ourselves. And this simplest form of prayer is in some respects the most fruitful. For the blessings thus to be obtained are the greatest. To learn that they may be obtained by asking for, has been to thousands an era in the spiritual life.

In 2 Cor. 12^{8}, Paul prays earnestly for DELIVERANCE from bodily AFFLICTION. His example justifies such prayers. But they must ever be offered with profound submission to the unknown will of God. Of such submission, we have a supreme example in Mk. 14^{36}. Such prayers can never be unanswered: but the answer may, as in the above case of Paul, assume a form neither desired nor thought of by the offerer.

Prayer for spiritual good of OTHERS is justified by the examples in § 324 from Paul's letters. But an answer to such

prayers involves, in addition to him who prays and God who hears, a third personality, viz. the person on whose behalf prayer is made. It is therefore conditioned by the freewill of another, by the awful prerogative, given by God to every man, of refusing and resisting spiritual blessing. This divinely-given prerogative, no prayers of another can efface. But Paul's earnest and constant prayers for others and Christ's prayer (Lk. 22^{32}) that Peter's faith might not fail imply that such prayers are acceptable to God: and, if so, they cannot pass unanswered. We infer therefore that in answer to such prayers God will bring to bear on those for whom we pray spiritual influences tending towards salvation; although the effect of these influences depends ultimately on the persons in question.

328. We cannot and need not discuss here the relation of prayer to NATURAL LAW. If we can, by adapting our action to the forces of nature, use them to work out our purposes, if we can deflect from their course the operation of natural forces, as when men catch a ball which otherwise would have struck the ground, surely He from whom all natural forces spring can so use them as to work out through them His will towards men; and His will is, as we have learnt, to answer prayer. We pray with complete confidence, because our prayers are offered "to Him who is able to do exceeding abundantly beyond all we ask or think."

Prayer is in some sense a correlative to God's revelation of Himself to man. It is an expression of man's apprehension and approval of, and desire for, the revealed will of God. He makes known His purpose to bless: man hears and approves; and asks for, and expects, its accomplishment. Of this accomplishment, God has thought fit to make man's approval and expectation a condition.

329. Already, in Jno. $17^{11\text{-}24}$, Lk. 22^{32}, we have heard Christ

praying for those for whom He was about to die. In Rom. 8^{34}, the RISEN LORD "INTERCEDES on our behalf." To this abiding intercession is attributed in Heb. 7^{25} Christ's ability to save. All this teaches that the prayer of Christ for His disciples, begun on earth, is continued now on the throne of God; and that the salvation which God works in those that believe is not only a result of Christ's death but an answer to His living prayer. This is the supreme example of prayer.

The intercession of Christ is closely related to the PROPITIATION for sins in His death: see § 191. This is suggested by the mention of "priesthood" and "high priest" both before and after the intercession of Christ in Heb. 7^{25}: cp. Lev. 4^{20}. The line of thought recalls the incense, a silent and symbolic prayer, with which, on the Day of Atonement (Lev. 16^{12}), the high priest went into the most holy place, with the blood of slain animals, to make propitiation for the sins of the people. But this intercession is not, as some have caricatured it, a means of persuading God to pardon. It was ordained by God as a means by which guilty man should approach Him. So Christ pleads, not as though He were our friend and God our enemy, but as ordained by God to plead for those for whom God gave Him to die. His intercession sets before us, in a form suggested by the O.T. ritual, the great truth that His death was needful for our salvation: see § 194. And doubtless for this end the ritual was ordained by God. Thus our own prayers derive their effect from His intercession. They have also an eternal archetype within the Godhead: and our knowledge that, while we plead on earth, there pleads for us in heaven One who cannot plead in vain assures us that our prayers will be answered.

330. In Rom. 8^{26}, the SPIRIT OF GOD "intercedes on behalf of saints." He prays for them by moving them to

pray, and thus praying in them; so Gal. 4^{6}, compared with Rom. 8^{15}. To know this, greatly aids our faith, and thus gives effect to our prayers. This prayer implies the distinct personality of the Holy Spirit: see § 115.

Thus in our prayers each divine Person has a definite and characteristic part. They are offered in the Spirit, through the Son, to the Father. The Spirit dwelling in our hearts moves us to pray, and thus gives to our prayers His own authority: only through the abiding propitiation in the death of the incarnate Son can the prayers of sinful man be acceptable to God: and the Father who gave His Son to die is Himself the Hearer and Answerer of prayer. Thus man's intercourse with God in prayer has its divine source and counterpart in the intercession, prompted by and acceptable to the Father, of the Son and Spirit on man's behalf. We wonder not that prayer, springing as it does from the eternal relation of the Persons of the Godhead, is in a unique sense a means of grace.

331. Prayer is, in one important aspect of it, a solitary approach of man to God; just as faith is a personal reliance upon Him. But, just as one man's faith is often strengthened (*e.g.* Rom. 1^{12}) by that of others, so the experience of the people of God proves the great benefit of UNITED PRAYER: cp. Acts 4^{24}. In all ages, such united approach to God has been an abundant means of blessing.

Still more conspicuously do other means of grace, *e.g.* preaching and teaching, baptism and the Lord's supper, involve co-operation. For this, as we shall see in chs. 43, 44, provision is made in THE CHURCH of Christ.

By the use of the divinely-appointed channels of blessing, the New Life in Christ is maintained, in spite of hostile influences, and day by day attains a richer development. And each day's victory and all spiritual growth reveal the

reality of the divine life in man, and the truth of the Gospel which, under the shadow of the guilt of past sins and in present bondage to sin, we dared to accept as the word and promise of God.

332. The foregoing exposition of the Way of Salvation has been, for the more part, based on the teaching of PAUL. Some may object that the recorded words of Christ would have been a safer basis. These, I have carefully expounded wherever they were available for the matter in hand. But, for the details of the Christian life, I have been compelled to go to the great apostle whose care for the Churches finds permanent embodiment in his letters of counsel. Such teaching is not *Paulocentric* but *Christocentric*: for the whole teaching and life of Paul point to Christ.

We need not wonder that CHRIST did not discuss the details of the Christian life. For nearly all His recorded words were spoken before the manifestation of His glory by His death and resurrection. Yet He gave the germs of all that Paul afterwards taught. The development of these germs was left to the necessities of actual church-life, under the guidance of the Spirit of God. Of that guidance Paul was a chosen instrument. He discusses details as does no other N.T. writer. Consequently his letters are a store-house of instruction from which I have drawn whatever I could. But I have not knowingly overlooked any word of Christ.

PART IX

THE DIVINE-HUMAN CHRISTIAN LIFE

CHAPTER XXXVIII

THE ETERNAL PURPOSE

333. As from beginning to completion altogether a work of God, the new life is a "new creation:" 2 Cor. 5^{17}, Gal. 6^{15}; cp. Eph. $2^{10, 15}$. This later creative activity of God differs from the earlier one inasmuch as in it, beside the will and work of God, we find, derived from God, another determining factor, viz. the mysterious PERSONALITY and personal action of MAN. The relation between these two factors demands now our best attention. We shall begin our research by tracing up the work of salvation to its ultimate source in an eternal purpose of God. This will bring before us another important element of N.T. teaching.

334. Since all the best works of man (§ 2) are products of intelligence and forethought, and realisations of deliberate PURPOSE; and since we must think of God as Himself Supreme Intelligence, the Source of all other intelligence, we cannot doubt that also the salvation of men and the establishment of the Kingdom of God are in all stages an accomplishment of a divine purpose. In other words, the Kingdom of God among men must have existed as a definite thought in the mind of God before it existed in objective actuality.

This purpose must have been ETERNAL. For though we can conceive new outward activity of God, there can be in

Him no new thought, *i.e.* a conception not previously there. For, whereas action is passing, thought is abiding: and that which abides in the eternal mind must have been there from eternity.

From all this we infer that, before the earliest creation of matter, both the material universe and the Kingdom of God in all their stages existed as definite THOUGHT in the mind OF GOD; that whatever throughout the ages God has done in the salvation of men and in building up the Kingdom of God is an accomplishment of an eternal purpose.

335. The whole life of man and his rescue from sin and ruin are so closely related to his material environment that we cannot doubt that creation and redemption are mutually related parts of ONE GREAT PURPOSE. Indeed the earlier stages of the material world are of interest chiefly as preparing a platform for human life and history and for the work of God among men. Moreover, in view of man's sin, his creation would be no lasting benefit apart from the redemption wrought by Christ. Consequently, when God created the world, He must have foreseen that it would be stained by sin and by the shed blood of the Eternal Son: and when He linked together the various forces of nature, He evidently ordained them so as most to help forward the great purpose for which in future ages the Son assumed human form. The adaptation of each to the other reveals the Author's comprehensive plan. Viewed in this light, the successive stages of the material world, *e.g.* the creation of matter, the impulse which created motion, the creation of life and of man, are consecutive steps leading up to the eternal and glorious Kingdom of Christ.

336. God's purpose to save man could not have been prompted by any GOOD OUTSIDE OF GOD. For the harmony and unity of whatever is good reveals a common source:

and this can be no other than the One Source of the material universe and of the moral sense of man. Consequently, all human goodness is an outflow of eternal Goodness, and a work of God in man: and, as itself a work of God, it cannot be a motive for His action. If so, God's purpose to save man was not prompted by man's FORESEEN repentance, faith, or obedience: for all these are works of God in man. Both creation and redemption sprang only from His purpose to bless. Being Himself infinite love, He resolved to create intelligent objects of love, and to enrich them with His own fulness: and, since He foresaw man's sin, which can be forgiven only through some such manifestation of God's righteousness as was actually given in the death of Christ for man's sin, He purposed before the world was made to give His Son to die for the salvation of man.

All this does not exclude the CONTINGENCY of man's salvation on his own action. For man's action is an outworking of a power given to him by God: and we cannot doubt that God foresaw the entire future operation of that which He created. He must have known what man would do: and this foreknowledge must have conditioned the details of His purposes for man. We therefore infer with confidence from the nature of God, as revealed in the material world and in human life and history, that whatever God does, in creation, redemption, and the building up of His Kingdom, is an accomplishment of an eternal purpose; and that its various elements stand related as constituent parts of one harmonious counsel of God.

337. This inference was ANTICIPATED by clear and abundant N.T. teaching. In Acts 2^{23}, Peter speaks of Christ as "given up by the marked out (ὡρισμένῃ) counsel and foreknowledge of God." This implies that His death was part of a definite purpose of God. Moreover, the added word *foreknowledge*

implies that this purpose was shaped by what God foresaw that the enemies of Christ would do; thus pointing to another element in the gift of Christ to die, viz. the foreseen action of man.

In Rom. 8^{28}, Paul asserts an harmonious co-operation of "all things," which he traces to a divine *purpose*, stated in *v.*^{29}. Notice the composite words *fore*knew, *fore*ordained. Paul asserts that in the eternal past the eternal Father, contemplating the eternal Son, resolved to surround Him with other later-born sons, made like the Firstborn, whom he would not be ashamed to call His brethren. Of this purpose, whatever God has done in Christ is a realisation. Cp. Rom. 16^{25}, 1 Cor. 2^{7}, Eph. $1^{4,9}$, 3^{4-6}, 2 Tim. $1^{9f.}$ This *mystery* (see § 315) can be no other than the purpose of salvation which from eternity lay hidden in the breast of God and which in the Gospel is revealed to men. Cp. Rev. 13^{8}, 17^{8}.

338. Notice in Eph. $1^{4,5}$ two elements in God's purpose of salvation, (1) a selection or *choice* or ELECTION of the objects of salvation, and (2) a marking out beforehand or *foreordination* or PREDESTINATION of the goal to which He purposed to lead them. In the eternal past God resolved to save, not all men indiscriminately, nor on the ground of previous merit, but those only who should believe the promise of life in Christ Jesus. This selection, made by the sovereign wisdom of God, seemed to the Jews both arbitrary and subversive of morality. But Paul shows in Rom. 9^{6-13} that it is no more so than was God's choice of Isaac and rejection of Ishmael, and of Jacob but not Esau before the twin brothers had done good or evil. Paul's doctrine of election is only his fundamental doctrine of Justification by Faith viewed in the light of the eternal purpose of God. Similarly, his doctrine of predestination (see Eph. 1^{5}, Rom. 8^{29}) to be

sons of God, conformed to the image of the eternal Son, is but his doctrine of adoption looked at from the same point of view. These doctrines are a restatement of the Gospel in terms of the ETERNAL FORETHOUGHT of God.

We may also conceive God contemplating in eternity, with full satisfaction, the future REALISATION of this creative and redemptive purpose in the eternal glory of His adopted sons; and the successive stages leading up to this supreme result. We may reverently conceive the Father and Son contemplating the cost of this realisation, viz. the self-emptying, incarnation, and death, of the eternal Son; and in view of the glory to follow deliberately purposing this stupendous sacrifice. This purpose is an eternal outflow, as each step of its realisation is an historic outflow, of that love which is the inmost essence of God.

No doctrine of election or predestination is CATEGORICALLY ASSERTED in the N.T.; as the doctrines of justification through faith and through the death of Christ are asserted in Rom. $3^{21\text{-}26}$. They are mentioned only casually to illustrate some other subject. This warns us that these casual references must be interpreted in the light of the doctrines categorically and frequently stated; and not conversely.

339. The first step in this realisation must apparently have been the creation of MATTER. And this, in its earliest form, we cannot conceive as other than homogeneous: for heterogeneity would imply a previous history. This original matter must have been endowed with inherent forces, or rather a FORCE, of which the known natural forces are specialised developments: and, at its creation or subsequently, it must have received the primal impulse which created MOTION and broke up its homogeneity: see § 5. In matter thus created, we have an objective reality other than God,

Himself the original and eternal Reality: and in its movements we have activity derived from God but distinct and different from the ever-active thought of God.

Under the influence of this primal impulse, and of the reaction of the inherent forces of nature, we must conceive the evolution of the SOLAR SYSTEM, and especially of our planet, as a suitable home for man and a suitable platform for human history.

340. The advent of LIFE created a new era in the progressive realisation of the purpose of God: see §§ 3, 232f. In living bodies we see new forces at work differing widely from, yet closely related to, the forces operating in inorganic matter; a many-sided development of innumerable varieties; and a well-sustained progress from lower to higher forms. The progressive specialisation of bodily forms was followed by the dawn and development of animal sensation and intelligence. Looking back on these from the higher standpoint of human intelligence, we see in them another step forward in the accomplishment of the creative purpose of God. The significance of this stage is indicated by the use of the word *life* to describe both the lower animals and the blessed condition of saved mankind: for this various use of the same word reveals a connection between the very different objects denoted by it.

With life, appeared also an element of apparent discord, viz. suffering and DEATH, the dark counterfoil to all forms of life. But even death helps forward the progressive purpose of God: for the destruction of the less fit opened a way for higher and still higher forms of life.

341. Another stage was the appearance of MAN, combining in himself and surpassing infinitely all earlier progress. In him we see a capacity for development, especially of the individual, leaving far behind all animal life. Man's intelli-

gence differs in kind, especially in capacity for development, from that of animals: and his moral sense is an element altogether new.

This new development, however, brings to view a discord far more serious than even suffering and death. The dark shadow of SIN, as something opposed utterly to the intelligent Source of all things, falls across the scene now opening to our view. It reveals an actor other than, and opposed to, God: and the presence of sin hinders seriously the harmonious realisation of His purpose.

But God did not leave man in his sin. We found Him using means to lead him back to obedience and life; and using sin, even in its most tremendous form, viz. the murder of Christ, to work out His purpose of mercy. Thus under the shadow of death, amid the discord caused by sin, with progress rapid or slow, and in spite of occasional retrogression, during the ages, the great purpose of God has advanced towards fuller and fuller realisation.

342. By His covenant with ABRAHAM, God linked Himself with man more closely than ever before; and by the deliverance FROM EGYPT and the ordinances given at SINAI, He placed the whole Israelite nation in special relation to Himself and gave to it a knowledge of Himself not shared by other nations. By its CAPTIVITY among the heathen, the sacred nation was weaned from idolatry: and by the return from captivity a people was prepared to receive from the incarnate Son a Gospel designed for all nations. In the fulness of time appeared the expected SAVIOUR. Yet, to our surprise, He passed from view without having attained any conspicuous and world-wide results. But His followers at once began to carry to all nations the knowledge of God which had hitherto been a privilege of Israel only; and with it an announcement of salvation for all men, a salvation in its fulness previously

unknown even to Israel. And now for long centuries, in the Christian nations, the knowledge and Kingdom of God have been making progress among men: outside these nations and their influence is everywhere stagnation and decay: throughout the Christian centuries, an unseen guiding Hand is felt, and perhaps most conspicuously amid man's unfaithfulness and sin. As eras revealing this special guidance, we note the age of the Councils, the conversion of the Germanic peoples, the Reformation, and the Methodist Revival. Step by step, often hindered by man's folly and sin, the Kingdom of God has made progress: and Christianity now promises speedily to overspread the earth.

343. Another kind of progress is observed by thousands in their OWN inward and outward LIFE. A review of their own history reveals to them the same guiding and helping hand. This they recognise in early influences holding them back from sin and leading them towards Christ, in special help at special crises of their life, in deliverance where there seemed no way of escape, in increasing joy in God, and in sustained moral growth. Their own inward experiences reveal to them unmistakably the working out of a deliberate purpose of One who works all things according to the counsel of His own will.

CHAPTER XXXIX

HUMAN FREEDOM

344. Two groups of phenomena cannot, or cannot without difficulty, be attributed directly to God, viz. (1) SUFFERING, leading down to death, and (2) SIN. Between these two

groups, which are classed together as EVIL, and are evidently most closely related, there is an immense difference, indicated by the different emotions aroused in us by a great calamity and a great crime: see § 10. The different emotions evoked by these different forms of evil reveal their different kind of incongruity to the nature of God. Suffering cannot be in itself an end desired by Him whose one aim is to bless: but sin is utterly abhorrent to God, and cannot be in any way His work. Yet we have no difficulty in believing that God has linked together sin and suffering in that close relation to which the moral life of men bears witness. These strange phenomena need further attention.

345. We cannot throw off a conviction that we are ourselves the ULTIMATE SOURCE of our own actions; that, although these may be due in some measure to various external influences, the real responsibility rests with ourselves alone. Frequently this sense of sole responsibility is most painful. If we could persuade ourselves that some action of ours which we are compelled to condemn was due to an irresistible influence, outward or inward, we should be greatly relieved. But this relief is often denied us. Our actions claim us as their author; and forbid us to say that their ultimate source is elsewhere than in ourselves.

This deep-rooted and far-reaching conviction, which underlies and colours all human thought and literature, cannot be a delusion. Otherwise all human thought is untrustworthy. If our moral estimate of ourselves and others be without foundation, we must in despair abandon all efforts to learn the significance of life; and sink to the level of brutes.

346. Again, a wide experience teaches that this sense of responsibility is a powerful DETERRENT FROM SIN and a stimulus to virtue. Consequently, to teach that it is a delusion, is to break down a moral safeguard and to rob man

of a moral helper. If the truth demands this sacrifice, then is the truth an enemy to our highest interests. This cannot be. An irresistible conviction, rooted in that in man which is noblest and best, compels us to believe that that which is morally hurtful cannot be true. If so, our conviction that we are ourselves solely responsible for our own actions is and must be essential truth. In other words, our deep conviction that in the moment of decision we are free to yield to, or resist, the influences brought to bear upon us, and that the ultimate decision is with ourselves alone, is attested not only by the strength of the conviction but by the moral ruin involved in a denial of its truth. Certainly we shall not accept such denial unless it be supported by evidence equal to the combined evidence just adduced.

347. The above teaching is contradicted by not a few MODERN WRITERS. So J. S. Mill, *System of Logic* bk. vi. ch. 2: "The question, whether the law of causality applies in the same strict sense to human actions as to other phenomena, is the celebrated controversy about the freedom of the will: which from at least as far back as the time of Pelagius has divided both the philosophical and the religious world. The affirmative opinion is commonly called the doctrine of Necessity, as asserting human volitions and actions to be necessary and inevitable. The negative maintains that the will is not determined, like other phenomena by antecedents, but determines itself; that our volitions are not, properly speaking, the effects of causes, or at least have no causes which they uniformly and implicitly obey.

"I have already made it sufficiently apparent that the former of these opinions is that which I consider the true one. . . .

"Correctly conceived, the doctrine called Philosophical Necessity is simply this: that, given the motives which are present to an individual's mind, and given likewise the character and disposition of the individual, the manner in which he will act might be unerringly inferred: that if we knew the person thoroughly, and knew all the inducements which are acting upon him, we could foretell his conduct with as much certainty as we can predict any physical event."

Similar teaching underlies the *Synthetic Philosophy* of Herbert Spencer, *e.g.* his *Principles of Psychology*, bk. iv. ch. 9, on *The Will*; and is accepted by most modern Scientific Agnostics as a logical result of their principles.

348. Already we have seen that this theory is contradicted by a conviction too deep and wide-spread to be a delusion; and by the moral ruin it involves. A theory open to contradiction so serious cannot be accepted unless supported by overwhelming proof. The only proof adduced is one suggested in the above extract, viz. that all other phenomena are governed by invariable sequence, and that if human action be not so governed it is a SOLITARY EXCEPTION to an otherwise universal law. But indisputably human action does occupy, as the universal estimate of it loudly asserts, a position apart from, and superior to, all other phenomena. We have therefore no right to assume that what is true of the lower is true also of the higher. Certainly, this assumption is of no weight against man's deep conviction that in action he is free; and against his experience of the moral injury involved in a denial of his freedom.

We are reminded that the progress of research has extended greatly the realm of invariable sequence: and some (*e.g.* Huxley in his *Physical Basis of Life*) have asserted, assuming the *rôle* of a prophet, that future research will

"gradually extend the realm of matter and law until it is co-extensive with knowledge, with feeling, and with action." But the progress of modern research is not more wonderful than are its LIMITS. The great questions, *e.g.* the origin of matter, of motion, of life, of the moral sense, are as far from solution to-day as in the days of the Greek philosophers; except so far as the Gospel of Christ has shed light upon them. Indeed modern research has rather revealed the insolubility of these problems. To assert the universality of inevitable sequence, is to claim to have explored the universe and to have solved its deepest mysteries. This claim we cannot admit: and with it falls the last attempt to prove that human thought, in its deepest conviction, is a delusion, and man a helpless victim of irresistible forces.

We therefore infer that, in the moment of decision, man is FREE TO CHOOSE to which of two or more contending motives he will yield; that he is not a mere spectator of contending influences over which he has no control, nor only an umpire who gives the palm to the stronger force, but that in action he is the actor, and that the decision rests with himself alone.

349. This inference does something to EXPLAIN the phenomena of EVIL. For it traces sin, which is in itself essential discord, and all its discordant results, to a rational source other than the Author of the universe. This by no means implies that sin is an effect without a cause, but implies only that its cause lies hidden in the mystery of human personality, *i.e.* in a personality distinct from the personal source of the universe. It implies only that He who, in accomplishment of a definite purpose of His own, created the world created in it persons who are, like Himself, each one the ultimate intelligent source of a course of activity.

Moreover, we cannot doubt that, in creating other sources of activity, the intelligent Author of the universe FORESAW the activity which in all ages would flow from the sources thus created. It has often been asked why, in full view of all the sin which He foresaw that men would commit, God gave them this terrible power of originating action. But the only alternative to such free action is universal mechanical necessity: and this would DESTROY ALL REAL VALUE of human life. The world as it is, stained with sin and full of sorrow, yet rising year by year and century by century with the spread of the Gospel, is infinitely nobler and better than a universe consisting only of invariable sequences. This alternative, the only one conceivable, is sufficient to silence, if it cannot altogether remove, the above objection. Certainly, this question, perplexing as it is, is not sufficient to overturn the above evidence, from the inmost thought and life of man, that he is the ultimate source of his own action.

350. The teaching quoted in § 347 is DESTRUCTIVE both of religion and of morality. By destroying man's real personality and reducing him to a mere machine, it shuts God out of His own creation and destroys all real intercourse of man with God. It destroys the unique evil of sin, making it only a misfortune; and it leaves man without any motive for contending against sin as such, and without power to contend. Fortunately a doctrine so destructive of all that is best in us is, as we have seen, destitute of adequate foundation; and is overturned by the facts of human consciousness.

CHAPTER XL

GOD AND MAN

351. IN § 185 we inferred with confidence that upon all men God is bringing to bear influences leading towards repentance and salvation, influences without which none can be saved. To these influences, some yield, and are saved: others resist them, and are lost. We have now seen that the ultimate source of these saving influences is an eternal purpose of God. But what about the lost? What is the ultimate reason why, while some yield to these influences and are saved, OTHERS REJECT them and PERISH?

The many pathetic appeals in the Bible, *e.g.* Isa. 1^{5}, Jer. $2^{14, 17}$, Ezek. 18^{31f}, Mt. 23^{37}, Jno. 5^{40}, imply that the reason we seek is altogether in man and not at all in God; and this is strongly confirmed (see § 317) by many warnings to believers that unless they continue in faith and good works they will fall away and ultimately perish. These important elements in the teaching of the Bible are meaningless unless the work of God in man, in its beginning and continuance, be contingent on man's free surrender to God. The reason we seek lies hidden in the mystery of man's own FREE CHOICE.

352. This contingency is not inconsistent with the OMNIPOTENCE of God. For this attribute implies, not necessarily the actual putting forth of infinite power, but only a capacity for action limited only by the will of God. To what extent, and in what directions, God will put forth His power, is determined by His infinite wisdom and love. Nor is contingency inconsistent with God's FOREKNOWLEDGE. For knowledge does not in itself involve influence on its

object. Therefore, since we know nothing about God's knowledge except from the analogy of our own, we have no reason to suppose that man's free agency is inconsistent with God's full and certain foresight of all that man will do.

The above teaching is strongly confirmed by the SPIRITUAL EXPERIENCE of the servants of Christ. We are directly conscious of a Hand from above guiding and raising us: and a review of our past life compels us to believe that we might have followed that guiding Hand much more fully than we did; and that, had we done so, it would have led, and lifted, us into a life richer and loftier than we have ever known. Thus, in man's mysterious power to accept or refuse the good work of God in himself, we find explained the many imperfections, and the slow spiritual and moral growth, of the servants of Christ: and it is the only explanation possible.

From the above it follows that, in the Christian life, man is both absolutely PASSIVE and intensely ACTIVE. He is passive: for every good thought, word, act, is wrought in him by the Spirit of God. But, inasmuch as the Spirit, moving men from within, ever prompts personal activity, man's self-surrender to His influences is always followed by a corresponding putting forth of his own powers. And, when most passive, then is he most active: for, when completely under the influence of the Spirit, then are our powers of body and mind most fully put forth to work out the purposes of God.

353. Another form of God's work in man deserves serious attention. The SPIRITUAL SENSE of those who reject the Gospel is BLUNTED by their resistance to the light: and this inevitable result of their refusal of salvation must be by the deliberate purpose and righteous judgment of God.

It is a beginning of the punishment which inevitably follows disobedience. The purpose to punish is a dark counterfoil to the eternal purpose of mercy. Like salvation, this punishment is a work of God in man, contingent on man's own action. But it differs from salvation in that its motive and origin are not in God but in man. It is an abnormal activity of God corresponding to an abnormal action of man. We therefore infer that in the eternal past, prompted only by His own mercy, God resolved to save and bless, not all men indiscriminately, but only those who would, as He foresaw, accept salvation; and to punish with blindness here and severer punishment hereafter those who resist to the end His purpose of mercy: cp. Isa. 6^{10}, 29^{10}, quoted in Jno. 12^{40}, Rom. 11^{8}. In this sense we must understand Rom. 9^{18}.

354. The above teaching explains the SLOW and chequered PROGRESS of Christianity. It has been objected that the evils rampant in Christian nations, the many abuses in the Churches, and the defective morality of many Christians, disprove the divine origin of the Gospel; that, if it were from God, it would move forward with rapid and resistless progress and bring all men to bow to Christ with unreserved submission. But if, as we have seen, God thought fit to give to man the mysterious power to accept or refuse His best gifts and to yield to or resist His spiritual influences, we wonder not that in His purpose of mercy He resolved to respect the freedom thus given and to permit man to refuse the offered mercy. Admit this, and all is explained. Because man is free, the Gospel has been hindered by whatever darkens the mind and warps the right action of man. Because it is from God, it survived the hostility which at first threatened to destroy it, has changed the whole aspect of human life, has become the accepted belief of all progressive nations, has thrown off many corruptions derived from the human

imperfections of its advocates and adherents, and bids fair soon to cover the earth.

Moreover, the slow progress of Christianity, conditioned by man's free surrender to divine influences, is BETTER FAR than mechanical progress resulting from irresistible influences. Nobler is the loyalty of freemen than the unconscious and perfect obedience of the planets in their orbits. That man is actually free to yield to or resist the divine influences leading to salvation, we have in ch. 39 found abundant proof. It is equally evident that this freedom is for man's highest good: and, taken in connection with God's eternal purpose to save and bless mankind, it accounts for all the facts of Christianity.

355. This slow and fitful progress, helped and hindered by pre-existent conditions, is NOT PECULIAR to Christianity. Slow and irregular was the progress of spiritual life under the Old Covenant. More than once, the Kingdom of God in ancient Israel seemed to be on the verge of extinction as a moral force among men. But it survived, and achieved its purpose as a needful preparation for the Gospel of Christ. Still slower was the yet earlier development of vegetable and animal life, moulded and limited by pre-existent inorganic forces. At its first dawn and for long ages, life gave no promise of its glorious destiny: and the rude forces of lifeless matter seemed ready to overwhelm it. But the early and tender forms of life survived and grew and developed, until they clothed the world with a robe of manifold and marvellous beauty. Thus have new eras been introduced by the advent of new forces. Amid pre-existent forces once and again new life appears, with new laws of its own; and along these new lines, yet modified by existent forces, the new life has advanced from stage to stage till in each case it transformed and ennobled the whole world.

The above teaching is in HARMONY with the doctrines of ELECTION and PREDESTINATION as taught by Paul: for, as we have seen, God's eternal purpose to save all that believe, and to conform them to the image of Christ, involves a real election and predestination. It is required by the frequent N.T. teaching that Christ died for all men, that God desires all men to be saved, that salvation is altogether a work of God; and by the many warnings which imply that sinners are lost only through their own refusal of salvation.

356. Another theory now demands attention. CALVIN taught correctly that salvation, from the first good desire till victory over death, is ENTIRELY A WORK OF GOD and an accomplishment of a divine and eternal purpose; that we should never have begun to seek Him if He had not first sought us, and that our seeking Him was a result of His drawing us to Himself, and that every victory over sin and self is God's gift to us and work in us. But, from this, He INCORRECTLY INFERRED that God brings to bear, in pursuance of an eternal and secret purpose, on some and not on others, influences which invariably lead to repentance, faith, justification, and eternal life; and that the reason why these influences (without which, owing to the completeness of the fall, none are or can be saved) are not exerted on some men while they are upon others is entirely in God and not at all in man.

So Calvin, *Instit.* bk. iii. 23[1]: "Whom God passes by, He reprobates; and from no other cause than His determination to exclude them from the inheritance which He predestines for His children . . . The obstinate are not converted, because God exerts not that mightier grace of which He is not destitute if He chose to display it." Also § [7]: "I inquire again how it came to pass that the fall of Adam, independent

of any remedy, should involve so many nations with their infant children in eternal death, but because such was the will of God. It is an awful decree, I confess: but no one can deny that God foreknew the future fall of man before He created him, and that He foreknew it because it was appointed by His own decree." So ch. 24^{12}: "The same sermon is addressed to a hundred persons: twenty receive it with obedience and faith; the others despise, or ridicule, or reject, or condemn it. If it be replied that the difference proceeds from their wickedness and perverseness, that will afford no satisfaction: because the minds of others would have been influenced by the same wickedness but for the correction of the divine goodness." Also § ^{13}: "Let us not refuse to say with Augustine, 'God could change the will of the wicked into good, because He is omnipotent. Why then does He not do it? Because He is unwilling. Why He is unwilling, remains with Himself.'"

357. This teaching was derived apparently, as the quotation suggests, from AUGUSTINE. But he differs from Calvin in assuming that all infants dying unbaptized will perish, whereas those baptized will be saved; and that from some of the regenerate God withholds the gift of perseverance and thus permits them to perish finally. So *Reproof and Grace* ch. 18: "It is indeed to be wondered at, and wondered at much, that to some of His sons whom He has regenerated in Christ, to whom He has given faith, hope, love, He does not give perseverance: while to children of strangers He forgives so great crimes, and by imparted grace makes them His sons. Who does not wonder at this? Who is not utterly amazed at it? But also this is not less wonderful, and nevertheless true, and so evident that even the very enemies of the grace of God are unable to find out how to deny it, viz. that God makes to be strangers to His Kingdom, whither He sends

their parents, some of the sons of His friends, *i.e.* of regenerated and good believers, who go forth hence in childhood without Baptism; for whom He, in whose power are all things, might, if He would, procure the grace of this font; and brings some of the sons of His enemies into the hands of Christians, and through this font introduces them into the kingdom from which their parents are strangers; while neither the one nor the other, being children, have merit or demerit of their own will." So also *Grace and Freewill* ch. 44; *Predestination of the Saints* ch. 24; *Gift of Perseverance* ch. 21.

The above teaching contradicts utterly the universal love of Him whose tender mercies are over all His works; and abundant N.T. teaching that Christ died for all men: for, if from some men God withholds influences without which none can be saved, in no sense can it be said that Christ died to save them. It contradicts no less all human conceptions of justice, which require, in final issues, equal treatment of all men.

358. A strong protest against Calvin's teaching was given by ARMINIUS, Prof. of Theology at Leyden, who died in A.D. 1609. Of his opinions, the following is a fair specimen, from "My own Sentiments on Predestination," *Works of Arminius*, trans. by Nichols, (Longmans) vol. i. p. 247.

"I. The FIRST absolute decree of God concerning the salvation of sinful man is that by which he decreed to appoint His Son, Jesus Christ, for a Mediator, Redeemer, Saviour, Priest, and King, who might destroy sin by His own death, might by His obedience obtain the salvation which had been lost, and might communicate it by His own virtue.

"II. The SECOND precise and absolute decree of God is that in which He decreed to receive into favour *those who repent*

and believe, and, in Christ, for HIS sake and through HIM, to effect the salvation of such penitents and believers as persevered to the end; but to leave in sin, and under wrath, *all impenitent persons and unbelievers*, and to damn them as aliens from Christ.

"III. The THIRD divine decree is that by which God decreed to administer *in a sufficient and efficacious manner* the MEANS which were necessary for repentance and faith; and to have such administration instituted (1) according to the *Divine Wisdom*, by which God knows what is proper and becoming both to His mercy and His severity, and (2) according to *Divine Justice*, by which He is prepared to adopt whatever His wisdom may prescribe and put it in execution.

"IV. To these succeeds the FOURTH decree, by which God decreed to save and damn certain particular persons. This decree has its foundation in the foreknowledge of God, by which He knew from all eternity those individuals who *would*, through His preventing grace, *believe*, and, through His subsequent grace, *would persevere*, according to the before-described administration of those means which are suitable and proper for conversion and faith; and, by which foreknowledge, He likewise knew those who *would not believe and persevere*."

359. The opinions of Arminius were correctly formulated by his followers, in a REMONSTRANCE in five articles, presented in 1610 to the States of Holland as follows:

Art. 1. "God, by an eternal, unchangeable purpose in Jesus Christ His Son before the foundation of the world, has determined, out of the fallen, sinful race of men, to save in Christ, for Christ's sake, and through Christ, those who, through the grace of the Holy Spirit, shall believe in His Son Jesus, and shall persevere in this faith and obedience

of faith, through this grace, even to the end; and, on the other hand, to leave the incorrigible and unbelieving in sin and under wrath and to condemn them as alien from Christ, according to the word of the Gospel in Jno. 3^{36}, 'He that believeth on the Son hath eternal life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him.'"

Art. 4. "This grace of God is the beginning, continuance, and accomplishment of all good, even to this extent, that the regenerate man himself, without prevenient or assisting, awakening, following, and co-operative grace, can neither think, will, nor do good, nor withstand any temptations to evil; so that all good deeds or movements that can be conceived must be ascribed to the grace of God in Christ. But as respects the mode of the operation of this grace, it is not irresistible, inasmuch as it is written concerning many that they 'have resisted the Holy Spirit.'"

The Remonstrants were uncertain (see Art. 5) whether they who have received spiritual life can finally fall. Otherwise these articles are in close agreement with the N.T. as expounded in this volume.

The Dutch ARMINIANS soon developed a tendency to Rationalism, which has somewhat discredited their protest against the teaching of Calvin. But the term ARMINIAN should be reserved for the teaching of Arminius, which was correctly formulated by the Remonstrants.

360. The SYNOD OF DORT (1618–19) condemned the tenets of the Remonstrants, in five *Heads of Doctrine* in general though not complete agreement with the teaching of Calvin.

So I. 1, "As all men have sinned in Adam, lie under the curse, and are obnoxious to eternal death, God would have done no injustice by leaving them all to perish, and delivering

them over to condemnation on account of sin." Also Art. 6: "That some receive the gift of faith from God, and others do not receive it, proceeds from God's eternal decree: 'for known to God are all His works from the beginning of the world:' Acts 15^{18}, Eph. 1^{11}. According to which decree He graciously softens the hearts of the elect, however obstinate, and inclines them to believe; while He leaves the non-elect, in His just judgment, to their own wickedness and obduracy." This contradicts Calvin's teaching quoted in § 356. With happy inconsistency, we read, in II. 6, that "whereas many who are called by the Gospel do not repent nor believe in Christ but perish in unbelief; this is not owing to any defect or insufficiency in the sacrifice offered by Christ upon the cross but is wholly to be imputed to themselves."

In Art. 17 of the ANGLICAN CHURCH and in the WESTMINSTER CONFESSION OF FAITH, we see the influence of Calvin's teaching; but its harsher features are modified.

361. Through the preaching of WESLEY and the METHODIST REVIVAL, the teaching of Arminius, as embodied in the Remonstrant Articles, has obtained wide acceptance in England and America. So Blunt, *Dict. of Sects, etc.*, art. Arminians: "In more recent times the dreadful dogma of Calvinism respecting Predestination and Election has been held by comparatively few persons, at least in the Church of England, and the doctrine of Universal Redemption, for which Arminius chiefly contended, is not disputed by any Theologians of importance." Also Canon Perry in the *Student's English Church History*, Third Period, p. 88: "It is hardly possible to exaggerate the debt which the Church of England owes to John Wesley in respect of his teaching on absolute decrees, particular redemption, final perseverance, and other doctrines involved in the Calvinistic controversy. Had it not been for the consistent opposition which he maintained

to these views, and the strenuous battle fought by him and his assistants against them, the cause of spiritual religion in the Church of England might have been inseparably connected with an antinomian system, which impeaches the moral attributes of the Deity as much as it excludes the proper place of righteousness in man."

Of the two great factors of the Christian life, Augustine and Calvin held firmly the first and chief, viz. that all good in man is a work of God and an accomplishment of His eternal purpose. But this great truth obscured, in their minds, a complementary truth, viz. that the actual result of this divine influence is altogether conditioned by man's free self-surrender to it. The former truth was held as firmly by Arminius and Wesley as by Calvin. But they added to it the complementary doctrine of man's freedom to accept or refuse salvation, which Calvin rejected, but which is necessary to guard the former doctrine from serious perversion.

CHAPTER XLI

RESULTS ATTAINED

362. So far I have endeavoured to set forth man's personal and SOLITARY RELATION TO GOD as restored by Christ and described in the New Testament.

In the material world around and in the inborn moral sense of man, we found clear indications of an intelligent Creator of the world and righteous Ruler of men, and of complete retribution beyond death: and in the N.T. we

found abundant teaching implying, in the One God, three distinct Persons, each holding a distinct relation to the universe and to man; teaching accepted in all ages by the almost unanimous agreement of the followers of Christ. In man as originally constituted, we found two mutually hostile influences, one indisputably higher and the other lower, each claiming to control his entire thought and activity and thus placing him under a moral probation. Our thought of God, and His voice of authority speaking to us in our own moral sense, evoked in us a consciousness of personal sin: and our efforts after amendment revealed our helpless moral bondage. But we found in the N.T. a promise of pardon for all who put faith in Christ, and of a new life of victory over all sin and devotion to God like the sinless devotion of the incarnate Son: and this Gospel of salvation we traced by abundant and decisive evidence to the pen of the apostles and to the lips of Christ, Himself raised from the dead in proof of His divine mission.

This pardon, coming as it does from One who claims the lowly homage of whatever in us is noblest and best, we ventured to accept: and, in proportion to our faith, we experienced the inspiration and power of a new life, this being a supreme verification of the faith which, in our felt sin and ruin, we reposed in Christ.

363. In considering first the relation of man as a unit to the one supreme Personality, we have followed the order of the N.T., where the salvation of the INDIVIDUAL always PRECEDES the AGGREGATION of individuals into the churches and the Church. The preaching of the Baptist, *e.g.* Mt. $3^{1\text{-}12}$, the great inaugural in Mt. 5–7, and the important introductory teaching in Jno. $1^{1\text{-}14}$, $3^{3\text{-}21}$ deal exclusively with the relation of the individual to God. The same order is conspicuous in the Ep. to Romans, where after paying homage in ch. $1^{3,4}$

to the Son of God, Paul states in *v.*[16], as his main thesis, salvation for everyone that believes. Only after a full exposition, defence, and development of this thesis, does he, in ch. 12[4-6], speak of the believer's relation to other members of the body of Christ. Evidently, in Paul's thought, the individual believer is the germ cell of the Church; and the Church is the aggregate of believers: and the same order is followed in the four Gospels. Indisputably, the pardon of sins for all who believe and a new life of devotion to God breathed by the Holy Spirit into those who in faith surrender themselves to Christ, were the kernel and marrow of the message of salvation brought by Christ.

The above order is a conspicuous DIFFERENCE between the NEW Covenant and the OLD. To Israel, immediately after the rescue from Egypt, God gave forms of national worship and a fully developed priesthood. But the Christian Church was founded by the preaching of the Gospel, summoning individuals to repentance and baptism: Acts 2[38]. On the other hand, the preaching of Peter at Pentecost was at once followed by the gathering together of a COMMUNITY, in which two simple rites already commanded by Christ were performed; and, as occasion required, officers were soon appointed. To this community, led by the apostles chosen and sent by Christ, was committed the work of carrying the Gospel to all nations. Nearly always the individual owes his salvation to others who led him to Christ and taught him the way of salvation, and in most cases to the organized activity of the Church. So Paul in 1 Cor. 4[15] calls himself the father of the Corinthian Christians. In this sense, the Church is our mother, bringing forth and training for their Father's house the children of God. This further and very important development of Christian doctrine now claims our attention.

PART X

THE CHURCH OF CHRIST

CHAPTER XLII

THE TEMPLE AND THE SYNAGOGUE

364. So far we have considered the new life mainly as a solitary, and in great part unseen, intercourse with God. We come now to the outward and aggregate forms in which it has presented itself to the eyes of men. This inquiry will lead us back to the earliest origin of the Hebrew race.

By calling ABRAHAM to leave his own country and, following unseen guidance, to live as a stranger in Canaan, God placed him in peculiar and abiding relation to Himself. This relation was confirmed by special promises; and, when these had been accepted in faith, by a definite covenant which found visible expression in the rite of circumcision. These promises and covenant and rite embraced conspicuously Abraham's descendants: so Gen. $12^{1\text{-}7}$, $13^{14\text{-}17}$, $15^{1,\,5,\,18}$, $17^{2\text{-}11}$, $22^{16\text{-}18}$. Thus in Abraham and his family the Kingdom of God assumed visible and permanent form before men.

365. This unique relation to God was recognised, after the silence of centuries, in the revelation of God to MOSES recorded in Ex. $3^{4\text{-}18}$. In chs. 4^{22}, 5^{1} God speaks of Israel as "My son" and "My people:" cp. Heb. 11^{25}. The significance of these titles is seen in Israel's marvellous deliverance from bondage in Egypt, and consecration to God (ch. 19^{5f}) at Sinai. God thus separated Israel from all other nations to be specially His own. This close relation was confirmed, and stamped as moral, by the decalogue,

by the code of laws in chs. $21-23^{19}$, by the ritual of the tabernacle, and by the institution of the priesthood. Israel thus became (ch. 29^{45}) the earthly dwelling place of God, *i.e.* the organ of an abiding manifestation of His existence and nearness and power. The ritual was also a symbolic embodiment (see ch. 32) of important teaching about the way in which men must come to God.

In this symbolic worship, we find NO mention of personal CHURCH-MEMBERSHIP. The nation as a whole was the servant, and worshipper, and witness, of God. On the other hand, in Mal. 3^{16} we have an anticipation of the personal religious fellowship of the Church of Christ.

In Ex. 12^{26f}, etc., the Israelites are bidden to explain to their children the meaning of the ritual: but TEACHING was no part of the public worship ordained in the Pentateuch. On the other hand, in the rebuilt city, at the feast of tabernacles, we find in Neh. 8 the public reading and exposition of the Book of the Law.

366. A conspicuous feature of the N.T. as compared with the O.T. is the SYNAGOGUE. In many Gentile cities, in Galilee, and even in Jerusalem, we find congregations of Jews, among whom were not a few Gentiles, meeting for Sabbath worship: Acts $13^{5, 14, 43}$, 14^{1}, $17^{1, 10, 17}$, $18^{4, 19, 26}$, 19^{8}; Lk. $4^{15, 16, 20, 28, 33, 38, 44}$, 6^{6}; Acts 6^{9}. In Lk. 7^{5}, by an easy transition, the word denotes the HOUSE OF MEETING: and in ch. 8^{41} we have a "ruler of the synagogue." Similarly Josephus *Antiq.* bk. xix. 6^{3}, *Wars* ii. 14^{4}, vii. 3^{3}.

The rise of the Synagogue was occasioned probably by the DISPERSION of the Jews. In heathen cities, far from Jerusalem and surrounded by the hostile and potent influences of idolatry, the scattered servants of the God of Abraham needed spiritual help. Such help was stored up for them in the sacred books

in which was embodied so much of the spiritual life of their nation. But they needed also the encouragement and guidance and strength of spiritual companionship. Naturally, for mutual edification and for the reading and exposition of the Holy Scriptures, the more godly Jews would meet together on the sacred day. Such meetings would give visible form to the religion of Israel; and, by putting within reach of the Gentiles a purer conception of God, would draw, and actually drew, into a new religious fellowship the more devout of the Gentiles.

The benefit derived from the Synagogue worship by the Jews of the Dispersion would re-act on those in GALILEE and JUDÆA. It became everywhere a new and helpful element in the religious life of the nation. We need not wonder that even in Jerusalem, under the shadow of the Temple, foreign Jews gathered for worship in congregations of their own: Acts 6^{9}.

367. The Synagogue not only helped to keep alive all that was best in Israel, but was also a wonderful PREPARATION FOR THE GOSPEL. By bringing together in spiritual fellowship the more devout Jews, and devout Gentiles, it provided for Paul and his companions audiences ready to listen to and welcome their message. Outside of Judæa and Samaria, most of the earliest converts were won in the synagogues. In them the Gospel spread among both Jews and Greeks.

Moreover, these gatherings of Jews and proselytes afforded a pattern, both in their organization and government and in their spiritual worship, for congregations of Christians. Thus the Synagogue became a nursing mother of the Church. The infinite helpfulness of this needful preparation for the Gospel reveals to us in the Synagogue, itself a genuine outflow of the spiritual life of Israel, the guiding Hand of God. In it we find an institution not ordained by a written command but

manifestly prompted and given by God through a felt spiritual need and the inward guidance of the Spirit of God. In this respect the rise of the Synagogue was a pattern followed in many institutions of the subsequent Church of Christ.

CHAPTER XLIII

THE CHURCH, ACTUAL AND IDEAL

368. AT an important turning point in His teaching, Christ solemnly announced to Peter, "On this rock I will build MY CHURCH:" Mt. 16^{18}. These words receive emphasis from the foregoing question and answer touching His own dignity and relation to God, and from the subsequent first announcement of His approaching death and resurrection: *vv.*$^{15, 16, 21}$. They imply clearly that to erect a Church was an essential part of the work He came to do.

The word *church* is found elsewhere in the Gospels only in Mt. 18^{17}. But in Acts 1^{15} we find at Jerusalem 120 enrolled disciples of Christ. On the Day of Pentecost the number was increased to 3,000, united in close and continuous fellowship; and subsequently to 5,000: chs. 2^{41}, 4^{4}; cp. *v.*^{32}. In ch. 5^{11}, and frequently in Acts, Epp. of Paul, Rev., the company or companies of disciples are called "the Church" or "Churches." Evidently in them Christ's words in Mt. 16^{18} were finding fulfilment.

369. The ECCLESIA was an assembly, ordinary or extraordinary, of the citizens of a Greek city, brought together by a herald's summons: so Acts 9^{39}; cp. *vv.*$^{32, 41}$. The same

Greek word is frequent in the LXX. for an assembly of the people, as in Dt. 9^{10}, 32^{1}, 1 Chr. $13^{2,4}$, 2 Chr. 6^{3}; or sometimes for the totality of Israel, as in Neh. 7^{66}: meanings sometimes difficult to distinguish. Same use in Acts 7^{38}.

The words *My Church* in Mt. 16^{18} evidently denote the entire future company of the servants of Christ, which death will not be able to destroy: same wider sense in Eph. 1^{22}, $3^{10,21}$, 5^{23-32}, giving a colour to the epistle; and in Col. $1^{18,24}$; cp. 1 Cor. 12^{28}, Acts 9^{31}. More frequently the word is used in a local sense, as in Acts 8^{1}, Rom. 16^{1}, 1 Cor. 1^{2}, etc., Rev. 1^{4}, etc.: so the plural *churches*, in Acts 16^{5}, Rom. 16^{16}, 1 Cor. 14^{34f}, Rev. $1^{4,11,20}$. The word *church* never extends over more than one city, except where it embraces the entire company of the followers of Christ: hence "the churches" of Galatia, Judæa, Asia, in Gal. $1^{2,22}$, Rev. 1^{4}. Nor do we find more than one church in a city; except that in 1 Cor. 16^{19}, Rom. 16^{5} we read of a "church in the house" of Aquila at Ephesus and afterwards at Rome, similarly Col. 4^{15}, Phlm.[2]. These were probably Christian assemblies meeting in private houses. In 1 Cor. $14^{19,28,34,35}$, by an easy transition, the word denotes Christians actually assembled for worship.

These various extensions of meaning are easily explained. The Christians in any one city, even in so large a city as Ephesus, would naturally become one organized community, and were therefore called "the church in Ephesus," as in Rev. 2^{1}. But it was never forgotten that this local community was but a part of the whole company of the servants of Christ, and represented in Ephesus that greater community. On the other hand, a smaller community meeting in the house of Aquila and Prisca, as the whole church could not meet, would easily be described as "the church in their house."

370. Paul always assumes that church-members are believing

and JUSTIFIED children of God, in whom dwells the Holy Spirit: so 1 Cor. 6^{11}, Rom. $5^{9\text{-}11}$, 6^{22}, $8^{15\,17}$, Gal. 3^{26}, 4^{6}. Similarly, 1 Pet. 1^{3}, 1 Jno. 2^{12}, 5^{13}. They were also BAPTIZED, and therefore joined in visible fellowship to the professed servants of Christ: so Gal. 3^{27}, Rom. 6^{3}, Col. 2^{11}, 1 Cor. 12^{13}. This implies, not that there were in the churches no unworthy members, but that the writer leaves such out of sight. Similarly, the N.T. writers never urge their readers to accept the salvation offered by Christ: contrast Acts 2^{38}, 13^{38}, 16^{31}. All this suggests that the apostolic churches consisted of men and women who professed to have already put faith in Christ and were assumed to have obtained (1 Jno. 2^{12}) pardon of sins and (Gal. 4^{6}) the Holy Spirit assuring them of the favour of God. This ideal underlies the N.T. phraseology about the Church.

We therefore infer that in the apostles' thought THE CHURCH is THE COMPANY OF THE PROFESSED SERVANTS OF CHRIST in any one place, or throughout the world, or in earth and heaven. The N.T. writers charitably assume, and endeavour to help their reader's faith by assuming, that in them this ideal is realised.

In the letters written amid busy apostolic toil, Paul writes almost exclusively about the actual CHURCHES he had planted and their pressing needs: but in those written in his prison at Rome, these churches are far away; and his mind is at leisure to contemplate THE IDEAL CHURCH as in His eternal purpose it stood before the eye of God, and as in glorious reality and perfection it will stand for ever before the eyes of God and of angels and of men.

371. Much light is shed on the N.T. conception of the Church by FIVE important METAPHORS.

I. In Jno. $10^{1\text{-}16}$ Christ speaks of Himself as "the good

Shepherd," and His disciples as His "sheep" and "FLOCK:" cp. Lk. 12^{32}. In Jno. 21^{16} Peter is bidden, "shepherd My sheep." Similarly, "the elders of the church" at Ephesus, in Acts $20^{17, 28, 29}$: so Eph. 4^{11}, Heb. 13^{20}, 1 Pet. $5^{2\,4}$, Rev. 7^{17}. Same metaphor in Ps. 23^{1}, $78^{70\text{-}72}$, 80^{1}, Isa. 40^{11}, Jer. 31^{10}, Ezek. 34. It reminds us that the Church consists of distinct living individuals, each needing a shepherd's protection, which they can have only so long as they keep together and follow him. How many have first wandered from Christian fellowship, then lost sight of the Shepherd, and then fallen into spiritual carelessness and sin and ruin!

II. Closely related to the words of Christ in Mt. 16^{18} (cp. ch. 21^{42}) is the great metaphor of the Church as the TEMPLE of God; in 1 Cor. $3^{9\text{-}17}$, 6^{19}, 2 Cor. 6^{16}, Eph. $2^{20\text{-}22}$, 1 Pet. $2^{4\text{-}7}$. These passages suggest the meaning of the word *temple*, viz. the house or dwelling-place of God: so, in reference (cp. 1 Sam. 3^{3}) to the tabernacle, in Ex. $29^{43\text{-}46}$; and, in 1 Kgs. $8^{13, 27}$, in reference to Solomon's temple. The same word denotes frequently a king's PALACE, as in 1 Kgs. 21^{1}, 2 Kgs. 20^{18}, Ezra 4^{14}, Dan. 1^{4}, $4^{4, 29}$, 6^{18}, and in ch. $5^{2, 3, 5}$ where we have both senses together, *temple* and *palace*.

This metaphor implies that, just as in a building are many stones united into one immovable whole, each stone made firm by union with other stones, so Christ designs His people to be united together in firm and mutually helpful fellowship, thus forming a shelter and home for each one. Of that temple, Christ is the Builder; and, as Himself in His humanity a part of His own Church, its Foundation and Corner-stone. Moreover, just as in the tabernacle at Sinai God dwelt, revealing Himself to Israel and receiving their daily homage, so in the Church God now dwells, permeating the whole by His Spirit, receiving the worship of ceaseless devotion and praise and prayer, and thus revealing Himself

to men. So, in an infinitely higher degree, and in a unique sense, in the sacred Body of Christ (Jno. 2^{21}) God dwelt on earth, thus manifesting Himself to men. From that Holy of Holies there went up to God the incense of ceaseless devotion. In a lower but real sense, the Church is the temple or dwelling-place of God. As such, it will stand for ever, revealing even amid the glories of heaven the infinite grandeur and love of God.

III. In Jno. 15^{1-6}, Rom. 11^{16-24}, Christ is the VINE or OLIVE-TREE, of which His disciples are branches or twigs. Similarly Ps. 80^{8-15}, Isa. 5^{1-7}, Jer. 2^{21}. This suggests the continuity, in O.T. and N.T., of the Kingdom of God: for the Gentiles were afterwards grafted into the already-growing stock of Israel. A slightly different metaphor in Mt. $3^{8, 10}$.

A TREE differs from a building in that its development is an outgrowth of its own inner life according to the laws of that life. The Church is not a mere structure rising only by additions from without, but a living tree growing and bearing fruit by its own inherent vitality, each twig growing out of an earlier branch and drawing nourishment and growth through other branches from the root. Of this tree, Christ is Himself the Root and Stem, and the Spirit of God the living and life-giving Sap. Only by structural union with the Stem, and by the inward and unseen flow of the Sap, permeating every part, can the branches live and bear fruit.

372. IV. In Rom. 12^{4f}, 1 Cor. 6^{15}, 12^{12-27}, and in Eph. 1^{23}, $4^{12, 16, 25}$, $5^{23, 30}$, Col. $1^{18, 24}$, 2^{19}, we have the profound metaphor of the Church as THE BODY OF CHRIST.

In Rom. 8^{1-11}, etc., Paul teaches that in each believer the Spirit of Christ dwells, as the source of immortal life and of moral uprightness and the main-spring of a new activity. Consequently, the Church is the material and living dwelling-place of the Spirit, and the medium through which Christ

manifests Himself to the world and works out His purposes of mercy. Through His people, He smiles on men, speaks words of life, and saves the lost. Therefore, since the Spirit is One and believers many, and the many believers were joined in one outward and visible community, Paul spoke of the Church as the Body of Christ.

As in a human body, so each church-member is designed and fitted to do service for the whole, a service which can be rendered only so far as each member is animated by the one Spirit. This service corresponds to the natural constitution of each member. But, just as without life the eye cannot see, so, apart from the Spirit of Christ, the noblest human powers cannot do the work of God. Consequently, the various powers are the gifts of the Spirit.

Moreover, various men are endowed with various capacities for usefulness, *e.g.* wealth, rank, learning, intellectual power, eloquence, administrative tact: and these capacities, seldom found together in one man, are needed for the common good. Even the afflicted ones, by their cheerful patience, reveal to others the sufficient grace of God. Consequently, the whole Church has one interest. Whatever helps or hinders the spiritual life of an individual is gain or loss to the whole community: for his influence will directly or indirectly affect the whole. And each church gains or loses (cp. Rom. 11^{14}) by the progress or imperfection of its neighbours. For we cannot help or injure others without thereby affecting ourselves. By giving His Spirit to each member, God has bound together the whole company of believers into one Body having one interest.

From this metaphor, we learn our relation to Christ and to each other. In a healthy human body, each member is controlled and guided by the one spirit: and each is instinctively conscious that the interest of the body is its own

interest, and puts forth all its powers for the good of the whole. And so far as we are in spiritual health shall we be controlled by the Spirit of Christ, animated by desire for the general good, and in harmony with all other members. We cannot despise others; nor they us. For we need, and may be enriched by, even the humblest: and it is our privilege to help all around. Again, just as every man defends every part of his body with his whole strength, so will Christ defend with His infinite power every one of His servants. And just as a man's body shares his fortunes, so shall we share Christ's glory and sit down with Him on His throne.

To this metaphor, the Epp. to Ephesians (1^{23}, 4^{15}, 5^{23}) and Colossians (1^{18}, 2^{19}) add an important development, viz. that Christ is not only the animating Spirit, but the HEAD, of the Church. This could hardly have been in Paul's thought when he wrote 1 Cor. 12^{21}. The head is part of the body; but the highest, and immeasurably the noblest, part. As human, Christ is Himself a part of His Church, the seat of authority controlling the whole. Upon the Head is the diadem: but the whole body will sit (Rev. 3^{21}) on the throne in royal raiment.

This metaphor, unlike the other four, is peculiar, in N.T., to Paul; but is found in LATIN writers. So Seneca, *On Anger* bk. ii. 31: "It is wrong to injure the Fatherland: therefore a citizen also; for he is a part of the Fatherland. . . . What if the hands wish to injure the feet? the eyes *to injure* the hands? How all the members agree among themselves, because it is the interest of the whole that each be preserved." Also the well-known fable in Livy bk. ii. 32. That this analogy was observed by Gentiles, need not surprise us. For society was ordained by God; and is, even in its fall, a rough outline of the Kingdom of God. It is therefore

an unconscious prophecy of the Church. No doubt the analogy was suggested to Paul by thought current around him. And, that this Roman conception is reproduced only by the apostle to the Gentiles, is a mark of genuineness. Of the many metaphors of the Bible, this is the richest and fullest.

373. V. In Isa. 62^5, Jer. 2^2, Israel is represented as the BRIDE of God: in Rom. 7^4, 2 Cor. 11^2, and still more fully in Eph. 5^{22-32} in close connection with the foregoing metaphor of the Body of Christ, the Church is represented as the Bride of Christ. Similarly, in Mt. 22^2 God is compared to a king who made a wedding for his son: and in Rev $21^{2.9}$ the New Jerusalem is pictured as a "bride adorned for her husband." This metaphor implies that the Church, however unworthy, is the chosen object of Christ's tender love and loving care, from whom He claims unreserved loyalty, whom He will cover with His own glory, and make to be partner of His throne. This beautiful metaphor carries us forward to the great Consummation and to the eternal union of the risen servants of Christ with their already risen Saviour and Lord.

374. Taken together, the above metaphors give a somewhat complete view of the Church in its relation to Christ. The FLOCK reminds us that it consists of living individuals with many needs, surrounded by enemies and dangers, and unable to protect themselves or each other, yet kept safe by Christ so long as they keep together and follow Him. The TEMPLE represents them as closely united to Christ and to each other, thus gaining immovable strength: and as the visible dwelling-place of God, in which He receives ceaseless worship: for the stones are living, and cry out. THE FRUIT-TREE represents the Church as one organic unity, permeated by one life, and bearing fruit and thus in some measure making return for

the care bestowed upon it. Another metaphor recalls the various and variously endowed members of a living BODY; all animated by one SPIRIT and co-operating for the common good under its HEAD. The BRIDE represents the Church as, in a unique sense, an object of Christ's jealous love and as destined to share His throne. Each metaphor represents Him as occupying towards the Church a relation of unique superiority.

From these metaphors we learn that Christ designed His followers to be united together, in order that the company of His servants may be the earthly home of the family of God, in which its members may find shelter and nourishment and growth. Taken in connection with the commission recorded in Mt. 28^{19f}, Mk. 16^{15f}, Lk. 24^{47f}, Acts 1^{8}, (cp. Jno. 20^{31},) we may add a further purpose, viz. that by their co-operation, thus united in visible fellowship, the Gospel may be the more effectively proclaimed to successive generations and that thus men may be led to Christ as their Saviour and Lord.

375. With the above ideal, the Churches of our day are in PAINFUL CONTRAST. In all Christian communities are many unworthy members: in many individuals, along with real excellence, we see much that is unworthy of the name they bear: and between both communities and individuals has often been serious conflict. This contrast has been in all ages a most serious hindrance to the progress of the Kingdom of God.

This hindrance is not new. The men described in 2 Cor. $11^{13, 15}$ as ministers of Satan "whose end will be according to their works," those charged in ch. 12^{21} with gross immorality, and "the enemies of the cross, whose end is destruction," in Ph. 3^{18f}, were evidently church-members. For otherwise Paul

could not (2 Cor. 13^{2}) have threatened punishment, nor would he, in view of the hostility of the wicked everywhere, have written in "tears."

In 1 Cor. 15^{4f}, 2 Cor. $13^{2\text{-}10}$, Paul threatens punishment: and in all ages the various Christian communities have, in various ways, excluded members conspicuously unworthy. But such discipline, needful as it is within proper limits, must always be very imperfect. Only the eye of the great Judge can distinguish the wheat from the chaff. Moreover, discipline administered by men themselves faulty and fallible, is liable to serious abuse. In what cases a Christian community should exclude an unworthy member or inflict punishment, must, as occasion arises, be left to its own wisdom guided by the Spirit of God.

376. In the N.T. we have NO precise DIRECTIONS as to who are to be ADMITTED to the visible Church. The large number received at Pentecost (Acts 2^{41}) would not permit much discrimination. But the sword of persecution soon did something to keep out the unworthy. Indeed, the manifested power of God was itself a deterrent: Acts 5^{13}. Yet the gospel net (Mt. 13^{47}) drew in Ananias, and Simon the Sorcerer: Acts 5^{1}, 8^{13}. Speaking generally, we may say that the N.T. churches consisted of men and women who PROFESSED FAITH in Christ and claimed the blessings of the New Covenant. As such, they would be definitely marked off from Jews and Gentiles around. The mention of "names" in Acts 1^{15}, and the numbers given in chs. 2^{41}, 4^{4} suggest that their names were ENROLLED and counted. Such enrolment conduces greatly to the better shepherding of the flock of Christ.

The question of membership was complicated by the growth of Christian FAMILIES. Even the unbelieving husband or wife was in some sense "sanctified:" 1 Cor. 7^{14}. The little children, needing parental care and susceptible to

parental influence, stood in still closer relationship to the Church. It thus became an aggregate, not of individual believers, but of Christian families: and these afterwards became, in a looser but still real sense, Christian nations. Yet little children, incapable of personal choice, cannot stand in the same relation to Christ or to the Church as do those who have deliberately chosen Christ and formally joined the ranks of His followers. See further in § 442. Touching these complications, and the conditions of church-membership, the N.T. gives no precise directions. They must be left to each organized community, acting under the guidance of the indwelling Spirit of God: and the action of each will be influenced in no small degree by its past history. For practical and effective working, each communion must have rules and methods and conditions of its own for reception of new members. But, in framing and maintaining these, the ideal of the Church as portrayed in the N.T. must be ever kept in view. It is undesirable needlessly to add artificial conditions, lest we shut out from the visible Fold of Christ some whom He has received.

CHAPTER XLIV

THE CHRISTIAN PASTORATE

377. IN Mt. 10^{2}, Mk. 3^{14}, Lk. 6^{13}, after a night spent in prayer, Christ chose from His disciples twelve, "whom He also named APOSTLES," thus giving them a definite rank in the Church, the first rank: so expressly 1 Cor. 12^{28}, Eph. 4^{11}. The word *apostle* denotes one *sent* on an errand: see Jno. $1, 3^{16}$,

Mk. 3^{14}. In 2 Cor. 8^{23}, Ph. 2^{25}, it denotes men sent by churches on special business. In the presence of the apostles, and apparently of them only, Christ ordained the Lord's Supper, and Christian Baptism, and gave the commission to preach the Gospel: Mt. $26^{20,\ 26}$, Mk. 14^{17f}, Lk. 22^{14f}; Mt. $28^{16,\ 19}$, Mk. $16^{14\text{-}16}$, Acts $1^{1\text{-}8}$. After His ascension, their names are again recorded in Acts 1^{13}: and in *vv.*$^{15\text{-}26}$ a vacancy is filled up. This last implies that the full number was still needful.

Christ's words in Mt. 16^{18f}, whatever be their exact meaning, give to PETER a position of unique honour: notice also the contrast between *you*, in Lk. 22^{31} and *thee*, *thy*, *thou* in *v.*^{32}. All this points to him as, in spite of his foreseen denial, the designated leader of the apostolic band. As such, we hear him speaking in Acts 1^{15}, $2^{14,\ 37}$, 3^{12}, 4^{8}, $5^{3,\ 15,\ 29}$. From ch. 13 onwards, PAUL occupies the chief place. In ch. $14^{4,\ 14}$, he and Barnabas are called *apostles*: and in 1 Cor. 1^{1}, 4^{9}, $9^{1\text{-}15}$, 12^{28f}, $15^{7,\ 9}$, 2 Cor. 11^{5}, 12^{11f}, Gal. 1^{1}, etc., he claims this first rank. In 1 Cor. 4^{21}, 5^{3}, 11^{34}, $14^{27\text{-}34}$, 2 Cor. $^{2,\ 10}$, we find him, in a church founded by him, exercising conspicuous paternal authority. Evidently the apostles acted, in virtue of a special mission, as representatives of Christ and as the supreme human authority in the Church.

378. In Acts 6^{2f}, in a case of maladministration of money, the apostles call together the community and suggest that SEVEN MEN be appointed to deal with the matter, and thus to relieve them from work incompatible with their own higher vocation. This implies that till then there were no officers except the apostles: for such officers could not have been set aside. The mass of the disciples chose seven men: and these the apostles appointed, by laying on hands, to the work in question: *vv.*$^{5,\ 6}$. No name is given to the office thus created. But the incident reveals the supreme

authority of the apostles. It also implies that the pastorate outside the circle of the apostles, arose, not by express command of Christ, but under guidance of the Holy Spirit, to MEET AN EMERGENCY: a conspicuous contrast to Aaron and his sons, to whom was given, by express command of God, in Ex. 28^{1}, 29^{44}, $40^{12\text{-}15}$, an "eternal priesthood, for generations."

379. In Acts 11^{30}, in a time of distress money was sent, for the sufferers in Judæa, "to the ELDERS." The similarity of the occasion and the absence of any mention of another order suggest very strongly that these were the "seven" already appointed. For evidently, when appointed, they were the only church-officers: and it is most unlikely that, in another matter of finance, they would be superseded by another order about whose appointment nothing is said. In Mt. 21^{23}, $26^{3,\ 47,\ 57}$, etc., we find "elders of the people," an order among the Jews, often associated with the "high priests" and "scribes." In Ex. $3^{16,\ 18}$, 4^{29}, 12^{21}, 17^{5f}, the title may be traced back to the traditions of the bondage in Egypt. From this early use, it passed easily to the appointed leaders of the early churches.

To "the apostles and elders" at Jerusalem was submitted, by the brethren at Antioch, an important DOCTRINAL question: Acts 15^{2}. At Jerusalem the delegates were received by the whole church, in which however "the apostles and the elders" were conspicuous: *v.*^{4}. But the doctrinal question was discussed only (*v.*^{6}) by "the apostles and elders:" and, although their decision was approved (*v.*^{22}) by "the whole church," the formal decree (THE DOGMAS, τὰ δόγματα) came only from "the apostles and elders:" *v.*^{23}, 16^{4}. This proves that in the church at Jerusalem there was a definite order of men whom the apostles thought fit to associate with themselves when discussing a matter involving

the highest interests of the universal Church. The elders at Jerusalem are mentioned again in Acts 21^{18}, as associated with James.

In Acts 14^{23}, Paul and Barnabas "appointed *elders* in each church" founded on their first missionary journey. In ch. 20^{17}, we read of "the elders of the church" at Ephesus, of whom in *v.*[28] Paul speaks as BISHOPS, as shepherds of the flock, and as appointed by the Holy Spirit.

380. The only clear mention of church-officers, in the first three groups of Paul's letters, is Ph. 1^{1}, where we find again a plurality of "bishops" in one church. But in 1 Th. 5^{12}, Heb. 13^{17}, we have *leaders* or *rulers*. In 1 Cor. $12^{28\text{-}31}$, under the metaphor of members of a living body, each endowed with faculties for usefulness, all needed for the general good, we have apostles, prophets, teachers, and various capacities helpful to the community. Similarly Rom. $12^{6\text{-}8}$, where these capacities are described as (χαρίσματα) "gifts-of-*grace*, different according to the *grace* given:" so Eph. 4^{11}, 1 Pet. 4^{10f}. These last were not definite offices, but divinely-given CAPACITIES FOR USEFULNESS in the Church. The task of the Church, as of every community, is to discover them and to place the men thus endowed in such positions as will find scope for the most effective exercise of these various gifts. They are the spiritual equipment for church-officers. The indefiniteness of the above spiritual gifts suggests that in the churches addressed appointed officers were not conspicuous.

381. We turn now to the PASTORAL EPISTLES. These were accepted as genuine by Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, and Tertullian, towards the close of the 2nd century: and the absence of any reference to *bishops* as superior to *elders*, in conspicuous contrast to the letters (see § 385) attributed to Ignatius, is complete proof of their very early date, and a strong presumption of their genuineness. Indisputably they

describe the officers of the Apostolic churches. In 1 Tim. 3^{1-13}, we find stated the qualifications needed by *bishops* and by *deacons*: a close coincidence with Ph. 1^{1}. Light is shed on the "work" of a bishop in 1 Tim. 3^{5}: "if anyone knows not how to rule his own house, how will he CARE FOR THE CHURCH of God?" In ch. 5^{17} we read of "elders that rule well," (cp. 1 Th. 5^{12}, Heb. 13^{17},) and of some "who labour in word and teaching." Titus is bidden (Tit. 1^{5}) to "appoint elders in each city:" and this is followed by the necessary qualifications of "the bishop," implying that the offices are identical. He is called "God's steward," and must be able to exhort with healthy teaching and to disprove the words of those who contradict: cp. 2 Tim. 2^{2}. In 1 Tim. 5^{1f}, the *elder* is contrasted with *elder-women* and *younger* men and women.

In 1 Pet. 5^{1-4}, the writer bids his fellow-elders to "shepherd the flock of God," acting in it as *bishops* or *overseers*, "not as overlording" but as "patterns of the flock," till "the *Chief-Shepherd* shall appear.

All this proves beyond doubt that in the N.T. churches were duly-appointed officers called *elders* or *presbyters*, and *bishops*, these titles being equivalent, to whom were committed, under the apostles, the highest interests of the church to which they belonged. At Jerusalem, Philippi, and Ephesus, we find a plurality of men sharing this authority. But at Jerusalem (see Acts 12^{17}, 15^{13}, 21^{18}, Gal. 2^{9}) James seems to have held a position of unique influence. This may, however, have been due, not to official appointment, but to personal worth and influence.

382. In Ph. 1^{1}, 1 Tim. 3^{8}, we find, placed after the *bishops* or *elders*, an order of DEACONS. Same Greek word, denoting any honourable service of one for another or for a community, in Mt. 20^{26}, 22^{13}, 23^{11}, Jno. $2^{5,9}$, Rom. 13^{4}, 15^{8},

2 Cor. 3^{6}, 6^{4}, $11^{15, 23}$, etc.: a cognate verb in Mt. 4^{11}, 8^{15}, 20^{28}, 25^{44}, 27^{55}, Jno. $12^{2, 26}$, Acts 6^{2}, 19^{22}, Rom. 15^{25}. When used in this general sense, it is best rendered *minister*. This common general use of the word, and the subordinate position of the order of *deacons*, suggest that they attended to the material needs of the churches, leaving to the *elders* the higher spiritual interests. The order may have been created in order to relieve the elders from these material cares by allotting them to a distinct order, as at first the order of *elders* was created to give to the apostles similar relief.

383. Very little is said in the N.T. about the MODE OF APPOINTMENT of these church-officers. In Acts 14^{23}, Paul and Barnabas appoint *elders* in the churches founded on their first missionary journey. Timothy is said, in 1 Tim. 4^{14}, to have received a gift by "laying on of the hands of the presbytery;" and in 2 Tim 1^{6}, by the hands of Paul.

In Tit. 1^{5}, we learn that Paul had charged Titus to appoint elders in each church in Crete. But the complete silence, in N.T., until this late epistle, about any church there, suggests that Paul is writing to Titus, to whom (*e.g.* 2 Cor. 8^{6}) he had already entrusted other important missions, about the organization of new churches, committing to him a work which he had himself done (*e.g.* Acts 14^{23}) in other newly-founded churches but was unable, through lack of time, to do in Crete. We have no hint that Titus possessed any abiding prerogative of ordaining elders. To Timothy, similar authority was delegated at Ephesus: 1 Tim. 1^{3}, 3^{14f}, $5^{9-11, 19}$ But this by no means implies that he held a permanent position there. He and Titus seem rather to have been sent as special commissioners to various churches: so 1 Cor. 4^{17}, 2 Cor. 8^{6}. So Lightfoot, *Christian Ministry*

p. 28: "It is the conception of a later age which represents Timothy as bishop of Ephesus, and Titus as bishop of Crete. St. Paul's own language implies that the position which they held was temporary."

Still less have we any hint that the elders of the various churches were unable to appoint others to fill up vacancies, or if needful to increase the number of their elders. Of an order of men holding an exclusive right to ordain elders, we find in the N.T. no trace. That the "angels" in Rev. 1^{20} were bishops possessing such authority, we have no proof whatever: and this exposition is unlikely; see Lightfoot above p. 29. The direction in 1 Tim. 5^{22} refers probably to reception of church-members. In short, the N.T., while revealing plainly the existence of an order of men to whom were entrusted the most sacred interests of the Church, gives no specific directions about the mode of their appointment.

384. As an appropriate expression of the inner life of the early churches, their order of government as depicted in the N.T. claims respectful and careful attention. But we have no proof that the same outward order is BINDING on ALL future CHURCHES in all AGES; and still less that no forms of administration or worship are legitimate except those found in the early churches. Indeed, that these offices were instituted to meet emergencies, suggests that future emergencies may render needful other additions to, or modifications of, the existing order. Such an emergency was created by the removal of the apostles: and, as we shall see, this was soon followed by the rise of another order of church-officers.

CHAPTER XLV

THE PASTORATE: EARLY CHRISTIAN WRITERS

385. As in the Epp. of Paul, so in that of CLEMENT OF ROME (ch. 42^4) and in THE TEACHING OF THE TWELVE APOSTLES, we find only two orders of ordinary church-officers. This proves that at the beginning of the 2nd. cent. the development of the pastorate had not everywhere advanced beyond the stage portrayed in the New Testament.

In marked contrast to all this, the letters attributed to IGNATIUS, written probably very early in the 2nd. cent., reserve the title *bishop* for one man exercising undivided authority in his own church, with whom are associated a lower order of *elders*, and another still lower order of *deacons*. So *Ep. to Ephesians* ch. 4: "the *presbytery* is joined in harmony to the *bishop* as strings to a harp." Also *to the Trallians* ch. 3: "reverence the *deacons* as a command of Jesus Christ; and the *bishop* as Jesus Christ, He being Son of the Father; and the *elders* as a sanhedrin of God and as a bond of apostles. Apart from these there is no church." So *to the Smyrnans* ch. 8: "let all follow the *bishop*, as Jesus Christ follows the Father; and the *presbytery*, as following the apostles. Reverence the *deacons*, as God's commandment. Apart from the *bishop*, let none do any of the things pertaining to the church. Let that be reckoned an assured Eucharist which is done under the *bishop* or one to whom he has committed it. Wherever the bishop appears, there let the people be: just as, wherever Christ Jesus is, there is the Catholic Church." So elsewhere frequently. In the latter part of the 2nd. cent. IRENÆUS (bk. iii. 3^3) gives a list of twelve bishops of Rome, from Linus, to whom

Peter and Paul entrusted the *episcopate*, to the writer's own time. The literature of the 2nd. cent. leaves no room for doubt that a higher order, called distinctively *bishops*, was everywhere prevalent: the large number of *bishops*, *e.g.* one each at Hierapolis, Laodicea, and Colossæ, towns five or ten miles apart, suggests that there was a *bishop* in each ordinary congregation.

386. The ORIGIN of these congregational and monarchical *bishops* is easily explained. The needs and dangers of the churches made needful in each a single head. Perhaps imperceptibly in each presbytery the ablest or most influential man, *e.g.* James at Jerusalem, became its virtual leader. The manifest advantage of having a leader would suggest the appointment of a successor when he was removed: and thus the custom would become universal. This explanation is suggested by Jerome (died A.D. 420) in his commentary on Tit. 1^5, vol. vii. p. 562, ed. Migne. "*Elder* and *bishop* are the same: and before that, by prompting of the devil, factions arose in religion and it was said among the peoples, I am of Paul, I of Apollos, and I of Cephas, the churches were governed by a common council of elders. But, after that each one reckoned that those whom he baptized were his own, not Christ's, throughout the whole world it was decreed that one elected from the *elders* should be put over the others, to whom should belong the whole care of the church, and seeds of schisms should be taken away." Jerome goes on to anticipate my argument given above in proof that in the N.T. *bishop* and *elder* were the same. This quotation proves that in the circles in which Jerome moved the two orders were not looked upon as originally distinct, but that the distinction was prompted, as was the appointment of the seven in Acts $6^{2,3}$, by a later necessity.

Possibly this appointment of one supreme pastor in each congregation was suggested by the REMOVAL OF THE APOSTLES by death. While they lived, they were a bond of union to the churches under their charge: and their departure would create a new need. To meet this need, the churches may have endeavoured to strengthen themselves by concentrating authority in each church in the hands of one man; and afterwards by the assembling of these shepherds of the flock in councils.

387. CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA (*What rich man etc.* ch. 42) says casually, as an introduction to a well-known story, that after his return from Patmos to Ephesus, the apostle John went round the neighbouring places to appoint bishops and do other church-work. Similarly, TERTULLIAN, at Carthage, writes that in John's foster-churches, apparently those addressed in the Apocalypse, "the order of bishops, when traced up to their origin, will rest on John as their author:" *Against Marcion* bk. iv. 5. But these casual remarks, in books dealing primarily with other topics, written at a later date in places far removed from the places in which the apostle was supposed to have laboured, seem to me of no value. When everywhere one bishop was in charge of each congregation, in contrast to the plurality of bishops in the N.T., tradition, seeking to strengthen the prevailing custom, would naturally attribute it to the last surviving apostle. Such support is needless. The greatness of the benefit derived from it, we may almost say, its necessity for the survival of the infant Church, reveals, in this development of the pastorate as in (§ 367) the rise of the Synagogue, the guiding Hand of God.

THE COUNCIL OF NICÆA (A.D. 325: canon 6) decreed that the bishop of Alexandria, according to an earlier custom, have authority over the churches in Egypt, Libya, and

Pentapolis : similarly the bishops of Rome and Antioch. We have here another stage of development, viz. diocesan episcopacy, *i.e.* one man in supreme charge of many congregations, each under its own pastor.

388. A new element was introduced into the conception of the pastorate, early in the 3rd. cent., by TERTULLIAN at Carthage, who calls the bishop *summus sacerdos*, or *high priest*: *On Baptism* ch. 17; cp. *Prescr. against Heretics* ch. 41. On the other hand, in his *Exh. to purity* ch. 7, *Monog.* ch. 12, he asserts the universal priesthood of believers.

This language and conception were taken up strongly by CYPRIAN, a diligent student of the writings of Tertullian, who in A.D. 248 became bishop of Carthage. He claims frequently and emphatically for Christian bishops the prerogatives of the priesthood of Aaron, and charges those who refuse it with the sin of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram : *Unity of the Church* § 18, *Letters* 64, 54. Now God gave to Aaron and his descendants a definite monopoly of offering the sacrifices prescribed by Him : Ex 27^{21}, 28^{43}, 29^{28}. How exclusive was this privilege, we learn from Num. $16^{4-11.\ 31-33}$. By calling bishops *priests* and by charging those who set up rivals to them with the sin of Korah, Cyprian claimed for them a similar monopoly in the Christian Church.

389. This claim, involving consequences far-reaching and tremendous, we cannot accept without adequate proof. The only permanent priesthood mentioned in the N.T. is that of Christ and of all His servants : *e.g.* Heb. 3^{1}, 4^{14}, $13^{15.\ 16}$, Rom. 12^{1}, 1 Pet. $2^{5.\ 9}$. Sacrificial phraseology is never used for the pastors of the Church as such ; nor is a monopoly of administration or worship ever given to a definite order of men. To claim such monopoly, valid for all future time, is to overlook the essential difference between the Old Covenant with its prescribed forms and the New Covenant which is a

new life, not a new prescription. Even the officers mentioned in the N.T. are traced, as we have seen, not to a foregoing prescription, but to a practical need.

This being so, to call Christian pastors *priests*, is most misleading. For the reader of the English or Latin Bible will inevitably interpret this last word in the sense so conspicuous in the O.T., and will unconsciously ascribe to those called *priests* the prerogatives so conspicuously given to the sons of Aaron; the more so as most who call themselves *priests* follow Cyprian in claiming these prerogatives. This unfortunate designation has been a source of infinite error and injury.

When Cyprian became a bishop, he had been a Christian only three years; and consequently had not had the Christian education needful for a teacher in the Church. He saw, with a statesman's eye, that in his day the unity of the Church was essential to its survival, and welcomed any argument in support of its unity. In that conflict and in his loving and heroic defence of his own persecuted flock, he has our sympathy and profound respect. But I cannot doubt that the oversight, by this neophyte in theology, of the essential difference between the Christian pastorate and the priesthood of Aaron has wrought immense injury to the Church he loved and for which he died a martyr's death.

390. The churches founded by the apostles were united by common faith, by loyalty to one Master in heaven, and by common perils. This inward unity naturally expressed itself, with increasing definiteness, in one outward organization. The churches founded by the apostles held together in unbroken continuity, and held in the main the same doctrines, which last were in substantial agreement with the teaching of the apostles. Around them grew up in the 2nd century the chaos of the Gnostic sects, contradicting each other and

rejecting this teaching. The discord outside gave emphasis to the unity within. Thus arose the conception of THE CATHOLIC CHURCH, the one lineal descendant of the churches founded by the apostles. This conception received appropriate and conspicuous embodiment in the ECUMENICAL COUNCILS which, after the conversion of Constantine, assembled from time to time to formulate the belief, and regulate the discipline, of the universal Church.

391. For this Catholic Church, Cyprian claimed a monopoly of the blessings of the New Covenant. This claim was a logical result of his confusion of the Christian pastorate with the priesthood of Aaron. For we cannot conceive two distinct orders of priests, each claiming a monopoly of ministration, at one time and place: nor could there be such an order without express divine appointment. See Cyprian's *Unity of the Church* §§ 5, 6. "This unity we ought firmly to hold and assert, especially those of us who are bishops who preside in the Church, that we may also prove the episcopate itself to be one and undivided. . . . The episcopate is one, each part of which is held by each one for the whole. The Church also is one, which is spread abroad far and wide into a multitude by an increase of fruitfulness. As there are many rays of the sun, but one light, and many branches of a tree, but one strength based in its tenacious root, . . . so also the Church, shone over with the light of the Lord, sheds forth her rays over the whole world, yet it is one light which is everywhere diffused, nor is the unity of the body separated. Her fruitful abundance spreads her branches over the whole world. . . . The spouse of Christ cannot be adulterous: she is uncorrupted and pure. She keeps us for God. Whoever is separated from the Church and is joined to an adulteress, is separated from the promises of the Church; nor can he who forsakes the Church of Christ attain to the rewards of

Christ. He is a stranger; he is profane; he is an enemy. He can no longer have God for his father who has not the Church for his mother." Much more in the same strain.

This claim involves a DEFINITE THEORY of the Church, viz. as an organized community ordained by God, as was the priesthood of Aaron, and entrusted by Him with the blessings of the New Covenant; the one and only way of salvation. This theory was accepted in the West almost without dispute, from the time of Cyprian to the Reformation.

CHAPTER XLVI

MODERN CHURCHES

392. THE outward and organic unity of the Church, asserted by Cyprian, exists no longer. Instead of One Catholic and Apostolic Church, we see to-day MANY CHURCHES bearing various names needful to distinguish them, and with distinct organizations. The difference between past and present is illustrated by the infinite difference between modern Church Councils and that which assembled in A.D. 325 at Nicæa. However we may try to disguise it, the old order has given place to a new one, and the Church of Christ has entered a new stage of its development.

393. These divisions are an outworking of forces which none could hinder. The GERMAN REFORMERS could not and dared not refrain from proclaiming the Gospel which had made them free: and they who accepted it could not but unite in Christian fellowship in order to nourish and develop

the new life they had found. In so doing they retained, under protection of the Protestant princes, the old forms so far as they were available and suitable. Their fellowship was necessarily a revolt against the historic Church in Germany: for the authorities of that Church rejected and forbad the teaching which the Reformers had found to be the word of life. Luther had, at first, no thought of founding a new church. But the pressing spiritual needs of those whom his word, re-echoed from many lips, had saved compelled him and his companions to organize the Christian life springing up around them. Thus arose the Protestant Churches of Germany and Scandinavia. Similarly, those of Switzerland, France, and Holland. And when once the Christian life had begun to organize itself outside the historic Church, return was impossible. For that Church was unable to supply the spiritual needs of the Protestants; and required, as a condition of return, an assertion as true of that which they believed to be false. Thus, in these countries, through influences bad and good which none could hinder, the followers of Christ have been divided into different communions: and this revolt against spiritual despotism has been to them, I cannot doubt, an immense gain.

394. In ENGLAND, political causes gave another direction to the development of the Church. For personal reasons, HENRY VIII. set aside the spiritual authority of the pope, which for ages the Church in England had recognised; and appointed an archbishop who supported him in this revolt. ELIZABETH, on her accession, swept clear the bench of bishops, except one bishop who bowed to her will, and appointed others ready to obey her.

For proof of the abject submission or subjection of the Church to these monarchs, I may quote Canon Perry's *Student's English Church History*, *Second Period*. On p. 58,

we read, "Just at this juncture Archbishop Warham died (Aug. 1532), and the king at once resolved to appoint in his place the man who had latterly been the most prominent actor in the divorce business, and of whose sentiments he felt quite sure. Thomas Cranmer was nominated for the primacy. He shrank, we may well believe with sincerity, from the dangerous honour; but the king was not to be denied. Cranmer was constrained to yield, and in yielding, either at the king's desire or by his own device, he was unhappily led into an act of prevarication which seems quite indefensible. There was no formal rupture as yet between England and the pope. Cranmer must therefore obtain the bulls of consecration and his pallium as metropolitan from the pope; but in order to obtain these it was absolutely necessary that he should take the oaths of canonical obedience and subjection to the pope. As it did not enter into his intentions, nor into those of the king, that he should obey the pope, a difficulty arose here. Cranmer appears to have thought that he could get over the difficulty by taking the usual oath with a protestation 'that he intended not by the oath to bind himself to do anything contrary to the laws of God, the king's prerogative, or to the commonwealth and statutes of the kingdom.' Cranmer was thus taking the oath in one sense, while the pope was accepting it in another.

So on p. 88. "The last submission of the clergy to Henry VIII., subscribed by *the Upper House of Convocation*, May 16, 1532. 'We, your most humble subjects, daily orators, and bedemen of your clergy of England, having our special trust and confidence in your excellent wisdom, your princely goodness and fervent zeal to the promotion of God's honour and Christian religion, and also in your learning far exceeding in our judgment the learning of all

other kings and princes that we have read of, and doubting nothing but that the same shall still continue and increase in your Majesty—*First*, do offer and promise, *in verbo sacerdotis*, here unto your Highness, submitting ourselves most humbly to the same, that we will never, from henceforth, exact, put in use, promulge, or execute any NEW canons or constitutions provincial, or any NEW ordinance, provincial or synodal, in our Convocation or Synod in time coming (which Convocation is always, hath been, and must be assembled only by your high commandment or writ), unless your Highness by your royal consent shall license us to assemble our Convocation, and to make, promulge, and execute such constitutions and ordinances as shall be made in the same; and thereto give your royal assent and authority. *Secondarily*, that whereas divers of the constitutions, ordinances, and canons provincial or synodal, which hath been heretofore enacted, be thought to be not only much prejudicial to your prerogative royal, but also overmuch onerous to your Highness's subjects, your clergy aforesaid is contented, if it may stand with your Highness's pleasure, that it be committed to the examination and judgment of your Grace, and of 32 persons, whereof 16 to be of the Upper and Nether House of the Temporality, and other 16 of the clergy, all to be chosen and appointed by your most noble Grace. So that, finally, whichsoever of the said constitutions, ordinances, or canons, provincial or synodal, shall be thought and determined by your Grace, and by the most part of the said 32 persons, not to stand with God's law and the laws of your realm, the same to be abrogated and taken away by your Grace and the clergy: and such of them as shall be seen by your Grace, and by the most part of the said 32 persons, to stand with God's laws and with the laws of your realm, to stand in full strength and power, your Grace's

most royal assent and authority once impetrate and fully given to the same.—Collier, *Records*, No. xx."

395. On "The restoration of the Reformation movement" under ELIZABETH, see p. 256 of the same volume. "§ 8. In the proposals for the religious settlement no mention was made of taking counsel with the Convocation, as it was well known that nothing in the way of reforming views could be hoped for from that body. Every element of this sort had been fully weeded out of it, and both Upper and Lower Houses were completely of accord to maintain the most extreme dogmas of the old religion. In this respect it must be owned that the Convocation which met at the beginning of this reign contrasts favourably with that which had assembled at the beginning of Mary's reign. Then, although the whole clergy of the land had accepted and acquiesced in the Reformation settlement, only five divines in the Lower House were found bold enough to stand up for the teaching of the English Church. Now, although the sentiments of the ruler were pretty well known, the Lower House voted unanimously, and forwarded to the Upper House certain propositions, expressing as distinctly as possible, the doctrine of transubstantiation, and the propitiatory sacrifice of the mass, the supremacy and divine authority of the pope, and the right of the spiritualty alone to determine things relating to the faith, sacraments, and discipline of the Church. These propositions, except the last, were also signed by the universities, and the government was placed by them in a considerable difficulty. It would seem somewhat too strange and anomalous for the lay power simply to proceed to the reorganization of services and formularies of faith, when the constitutional body of the spiritualty was in direct antagonism to it. . . .

"Elizabeth's Act of Supremacy restored to the crown all

its ancient *jurisdiction* over all courts and persons; but it did more than this—it empowered the queen by letters patent, under the great seal, to give commission to such persons as she thought fit 'to visit, reform, redress, order, correct, and amend all such errors, heresies, schisms, abuses, offences, contempts, and enormities which by any manner spiritual or ecclesiastical power, authority, or jurisdiction can or may lawfully be reformed, ordered, redressed, corrected, or amended.' This was to go far beyond the legitimate province of the supremacy, and to arm the Crown with a new irresponsible power, superseding and overriding all the ancient forms of law and procedure, and able under the pressure of severe penalties to make its own will the absolute law for the guidance of the Church."

Pp. 263, 4. "The refusal of the whole body of bishops (with the exception of one) to act in the coronation of the queen, the vigorous and outspoken opposition which they had offered to the Supremacy and Uniformity Bills in Parliament, had not been resented. . . . It was evident, however, that after the passing of the Supremacy Act the bishops must either submit and take the oath, or be deprived. Accordingly, May 15, the fourteen bishops who were able to attend were summoned before the queen. She made a speech to them, desiring them to accept the laws recently made touching religion, and to put away the superstitious worship of the Church of Rome. Archbishop Heath, in answer, exhorted the queen to imitate the godly zeal of her sister for the true Church. Elizabeth made a spirited reply. 'She was convinced,' she said, 'that the way which she had chosen was the right one. Her sister had no power to bind her successor. She held her crown from God alone, with the consent of the Parliament. She was resolved to resist the Bishop of Rome's usurpations, and to hold those as

her enemies who upheld them.' The bishops, showing a courage and constancy which did them credit, all (with the exception of Kitchen, bishop of Llandaff), refused to yield, and were soon after deprived of their sees. . . . The bishops being thus disposed of, measures were taken to test the feelings of the clergy, to remove those that were obstinate, and to inaugurate the changed state of things. . . . A very small number of clergy absolutely refused all compliance with the new laws. Including the 14 bishops, only 189 are said to have been deprived in the whole of England, and of these six were abbots."

Under this violent compulsion, the Anglican Church, retaining in part its ancient forms, was forced along a new path. The result is a Church possessing a sort of lineal continuity with the historic Church of England, yet broken off, under lay compulsion, from the historic Church of the West, of which it had previously been a part. This revolt was justified by the serious errors into which the English Reformers believed that the Roman Church had fallen: and I cannot doubt that it has brought great spiritual gain to England and the world.

396. Other inevitable divisions followed. The ACT OF UNIFORMITY (A.D. 1662) left to a large body of Christian pastors no alternative except to abandon their position in the Established Church, or to take a solemn oath which they believed to be false. To their great and lasting honour, they refused to be false to the truth and to themselves. We wonder not that multitudes to whom their word had been the word of life still gathered round them begging for spiritual food. That cry, they could not refuse. Nor could they refuse to build folds for the sheep of Christ left without shelter. Thus arose the NONCONFORMIST CHURCHES of England.

With equal honour, Archbishop Sancroft and the NON-JURING BISHOPS and clergy, rather than take an oath of allegiance to William and Mary which their conscience forbad, resigned their benefices, thus exchanging, in some cases, influence and abundance for poverty. They endeavoured to continue an episcopal succession outside the Established Church, looking upon themselves as the faithful remnant of the historic Church of England. But the movement passed away without abiding results.

397. In time of great spiritual torpor, the WESLEYS and their companions could not but proclaim the Gospel which had given them peace. Nor could they refuse to the many souls saved by their preaching the spiritual oversight these last so greatly needed. Thus arose the METHODIST SOCIETIES. Wesley had no thought of founding a community outside the Anglican Church; and strongly urged his followers to remain in the ancient fold. But to that Church their spiritual life owed nothing directly: to his ministry they owed everything. Nor could they find in the Anglican Church the spiritual nourishment they needed. And the spiritual life of many thousands to-day, throughout the world, proves that their separation from the historic Church of England has not separated them from Christ; just as the spiritual life of the Anglican Church proves that their separation from the historic Church of the West has not placed it outside the Covenant of God.

In SCOTLAND, various influences religious and political led to the legal establishment of a PRESBYTERIAN church-order. This was followed by various secessions, and lastly by the union of the two largest of them into the United Free Church of Scotland.

Thus an irresistible course of events has led the outward forms of modern church-life away from the Apostolic ideal.

398. We have various recommendations for restoring to the Church visible and organic unity.

A few (PLYMOUTH BRETHREN, etc.) would sweep away the historic Christianity of nineteen centuries, and begin to re-erect the Church, taking the N.T. as a ground-plan and trying to reproduce exactly the forms of church-government there portrayed. But the growth and experience of the centuries are far too precious to be thus set aside. To the Christian life existing at our birth and before we were born we owe our knowledge of God and our spiritual life. Moreover, the outward forms of the Apostolic churches are as unfit for present needs as are the clothes of childhood to a full-grown man. The Gospel is not a written prescription but a life: and life ever robes itself in new forms. To ignore the developments of the past, is to throw away the hope of healthy development in the future.

Others suggest, as a means of restoring unity, that all other Christians should join their own communion; that the members of other Churches should forsake the home in which they have found spiritual life and nourishment and seek entrance into the speaker's own Church. Of those who advocate this suggestion, most or all assert that there is and can be only ONE LEGITIMATE VISIBLE CHURCH, at least in one place, viz. the lineal descendant of the Churches founded by the apostles, that to this alone belongs the Covenant of God, and that to this one Church we are bound at all costs to return. This suggestion at once raises the question, which is this one legitimate Church? Various communions claim this solitary honour.

399. The strongest form of this claim is that of the ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH, which still adopts the language of Cyprian (see § 388) and claims a monopoly of the blessings of the New Covenant as the one Church founded by Christ. It

requires its converts, in the *Profession of Faith* sanctioned by Pius IV. in 1564 soon after the close of the Council of Trent, to say, after reciting the Nicene Creed, "The Apostolical and ecclesiastic traditions and the other observances and constitutions of the same Church, I most firmly admit and embrace. Also the Sacred Scripture according to that sense which Holy Mother Church, whose it is to judge touching the true sense and interpretation of the Sacred Scriptures, has held and holds; nor will I ever accept and interpret it except according to the unanimous consent of the fathers. . . . I recognise the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Roman Church, mother and mistress of all Churches; and to the Roman Pontiff, successor of the blessed Peter, prince of the apostles, and vicar of Jesus Christ, I promise and swear true obedience. Likewise, all other things handed down, defined, and declared by the all-sacred Synod of Trent, I receive and confess without doubt; and at the same time all things contrary, and whatever heresies have been condemned and rejected and anathematized, I equally condemn, reject, and anathematize. This true Catholic faith, outside of which no one can be saved, which I now of my own accord profess and truly hold, the same, God being my Helper, I promise, vow, and swear to hold and confess constantly, entire and unspotted, till the last breath of life; and to take care, so far as in me shall lie, that it be held, taught, and preached by my dependants or those under my control."

This *Profession of Faith* involves an admission that the Roman Church is an infallible teacher in all that pertains to God, and an assertion that outside its teaching there is no salvation. If this claim were universally admitted, all would join that Church, and unity would be restored.

400. But an intelligent man cannot, in a matter of supreme importance, believe without adequate proof: and any belief

not resting on such proof is degrading. No proof sufficient to justify this stupendous claim is known to me. A chief argument is that without an authoritative and infallible teacher there can be no certainty in religion, that the Roman Church, the lineal descendant of a Church founded by apostles and holding a position of unique importance in the West, and it alone, has always claimed this infallible authority; and that consequently unless its authority be conceded there can be no certainty in religion.

This argument implies that the only certainty in religion is one resting on an infallible teacher. But in this volume I have proved, apart from any church authority or any infallible inerrancy of Holy Scripture, by decisive historical and documentary evidence, that Christ claimed to be, in a unique sense, the Son of God, that He was raised from the dead, and that He proclaimed, for all who put faith in Him and walk in His steps, pardon of sins and the Spirit of God to be in them the breath of a new life of devotion to Christ. Myriads outside the Roman Church have ventured to believe this Gospel of life; and have thus found a power to live a new life which their moral sense attests to be divine. Thus have arisen Christian communities outside the Roman Church which for centuries have sheltered a spiritual life as rich as can be found within the ancient fold. This abundant spiritual life is a decisive visible disproof of the Roman claim.

401. Not a few ANGLICANS, inventing a feebler imitation of the Roman claim, assert that in England their own is the one and only legitimate Church, on the ground that it is the lineal descendant of the pre-Reformation Church in England, and that there can be only one Church in one country. But, on this ground, it is difficult to deny the legitimacy, even in England, of the Roman Church, which

is certainly the lineal descendant of the Mother-Church of the West. Nor is it easy to prove that any ecclesiastical prerogative and monopoly could survive the helpless submission of the Church in England to the violence of Henry and Elizabeth. This Anglican claim implies that, although a national Church may revolt, under lay compulsion, against the supreme authority in the Catholic Church of the West of which it was formerly a part, without losing the special favour of God, a private member, or congregation, or group of congregations, cannot, under any circumstances, separate from a national Church without leaving the flock of Christ.

A case in point will show the absurdity of this claim. In GERMANY, if there is only one legitimate Church, it must be the Roman Church, the only communion there older than the Reformation. Consequently the Anglican claim would compel every German to join that Church. But the *Profession of Faith*, requiring them to believe much for which they can find no evidence, compels the German Protestants to remain outside the ancient fold. And, if so, their spiritual needs require a church-organization. After the Vatican Council, inability to accept the new dogma of papal infallibility compelled many scholarly Germans to forsake the Roman Church and organize outside it another communion. If the Protestants and Old Catholics of Germany were right in so doing, there may be in one country more than one legitimate Church; and the above argument falls to the ground. Yet many who claim that the Anglican Church is the only legitimate Church in England fraternise with the Old Catholics who have set up and now maintain another organization alongside the historic Church of Germany.

Look where we will, similar perplexity surrounds all claims to ecclesiastical monopoly. No one, making such claims, can say which is the one legitimate Church in Scotland, or

Ireland, or Canada, or the U.S. of America. All claims to be the one, visible, legitimate Church are disproved by the facts of modern Christendom.

402. This claim is sometimes stated in another form, viz. that Christ ordained in His Church a PRIESTHOOD to be handed down to future generations only by ordination at the hands of an order of bishops distinct from, and superior to, that of elders, and that assured possession of the blessings of the New Covenant is conditioned by the ministration of this episcopally ordained priesthood. So Gore, *The Church and the Ministry*, 4th edn. p. 64: "But their authority to minister in whatever capacity, their qualifying consecration, was to come from above, in such sense that no ministerial act could be regarded as *valid*—that is, as having the security of the divine covenant about it—unless it was performed under the shelter of a commission received by the transmission of the original pastoral authority which had been delegated by Christ Himself to His Apostles." The writer is prepared for the logical consequences of this assertion. On p. 313 he says: "It follows then—not that God's grace has not worked, and worked largely, through many an irregular ministry where it was exercised or used in good faith—but that a ministry not episcopally received is invalid, that is to say, falls outside the conditions of covenanted security and cannot justify its existence in terms of the covenant."

For this limitation of the New Covenant, we may fairly demand decisive proof. We expect to find it in the Book of the Covenant, *i.e.* in the N.T., our only reliable authority for the actual teaching of Christ and His apostles. Instead of such proof, we have on p. 64f a very scanty and unsatisfactory argument, on pp. 69–74 three proofs "that the existence of an APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION serves several im-

portant ends;" and on pp. 75–101 answers to five objections. But in the N.T., as we saw in § 389, sacerdotal titles or prerogatives are never given to Christian pastors: nor have we in it any reliable traces of anything like Anglican episcopacy. In the many statements of the conditions of salvation, the ministration of an episcopally ordained order of men is never suggested. Faith is the unique condition of salvation. As commanded by Christ, Baptism and the Lord's Supper are obligatory: but we have no hint that their validity depends on the episcopal ordination of the ministrant. Moreover, this last suggestion is disproved by the manifest and continued blessing of God resting on Churches without episcopal ordination.

403. The limitation just combated would not, if maintained, restore unity to the Church. For in many countries, *e.g.* England and America, are two or more Churches, each claiming apostolic succession.

Many practical difficulties forbid the sudden removal of the distinguishing and separating features of our modern Churches. For these are forms in which spiritual life has clothed itself. Now life has needs: and these must determine its outward forms. Roughly to remove these forms would greatly endanger the inward life. In all attempts at union, the needs of the spiritual life must be carefully kept in view. On the other hand, to claim a monopoly of the blessings of the Gospel and especially to try to win members from one Church to another, is to scatter seeds of discord and to rend the seamless robe of Christ.

404. Another method of reunion, involving no danger and fruitful of blessing, is open to us. Let us keep ever in view Paul's ideal of ONE CHURCH AND ONE LORD, and work towards it in all practical ways. To do this, is not difficult. For, in spite of its many divisions, the Church is in a very

real sense One; and has one interest as it has one life and one Lord. Let us, in the interior working of each denominational Church, keep ever in view the interests of the Church Universal, looking at our own communion as part of a larger whole. Let no one try to advance his own Church at the cost of another; and let us embrace every opportunity of asserting the universal brotherhood of the servants of Christ and of helping other Churches. Such co-operation will reveal the essential unity underlying the variety of modern church-life: and it is the best possible way to organic unity. Only through the One Spirit can the Churches grow into One Body.

This suggestion FORBIDS, as contrary to the ideal, the NEEDLESS MULTIPLICATION of separate Churches, or the division of existing Churches except in very rare cases in which such division is needful in order to avoid some greater evil. Such emergency arose not long ago in Scotland: and I cannot doubt that the DISRUPTION of the Established Church and the formation of the Free Church were an outflow of spiritual life and a great gain to the highest interests of the Kingdom of God. Another emergency was caused by the VATICAN COUNCIL. But such are very rare. It is our happiness to see Christian thought everywhere tending towards re-union of separated Churches.

405. It is often said that the divisions of the Church are a great HINDRANCE to Christian work and progress: and certainly the claim made by some communions to be the only legitimate Church of Christ, and their refusal to co-operate with others, thus dividing into hostile camps the army of Christ, have wrought untold harm: see also § 422f. But this damage is caused, not by the divisions but by the claim to monopoly and the refusal to co-operate with others. For there may be plurality and variety without

contention. The needless multiplication of Churches is undesirable: but the MAIN DIVISIONS of the Church have been a GAIN to it. This is well shown, in reference to the great separation in England caused by the Act of Uniformity in A.D. 1662, on p. 610 of Green's *Short History of the English People.*

"If the issues of St. Bartholomew's day have been harmful to the spiritual life of the English Church, they have been in the highest degree advantageous to the cause of religious liberty. At the Restoration religious freedom seemed again to have been lost. Only the Independents and a few despised sects, such as the Quakers, upheld the right of every man to worship God according to the bidding of his own conscience. The great bulk of the Puritan party, with the Presbyterians at their head, were at one with their opponents, in desiring a uniformity of worship, if not of belief, throughout the land; and, had the two great parties within the Church held together, their weight would have been almost irresistible. Fortunately, the great severance of St. Bartholomew's day drove out the Presbyterians from the Church to which they clung, and forced them into a general union with sects which they had hated till then almost as bitterly as the bishops themselves. A common persecution soon blended the Nonconformists into one. Persecution broke down before the numbers, the wealth, and the political weight of the new sectarians; and the Church, for the first time in its history, found itself confronted with an organized body of Dissenters without its pale. The impossibility of crushing such a body as this wrested from English statesmen the first legal recognition of freedom of worship in the Toleration Act."

No Church has yet prospered with UNDIVIDED SWAY. Again and again rivalry has provoked spiritual activity. Different Churches embody different types of Christian life: and the

types thus embodied are a lesson and an enrichment to the whole. This manifest gain reveals the hand of God even in the divisions of the one Church of Christ. These divisions, caused or made needful by man's imperfection or sin, are God's own mode of purifying and perfecting His Church, and thus leading it to a higher unity.

406. The sectional Churches may be compared to the CHAPELS of a great CATHEDRAL. If at night we examine one of these by candlelight, it may seem to be an independent structure, yet a fit and beautiful place in which to worship God. But when daylight floods the sanctuary, the little chapel is seen to be but a part of a more glorious whole. Its distinctive beauty remains, and is more clearly seen. But our chief wonder is evoked by the grandeur of the vast structure of which it forms a part. In the rising Church of God, the scaffolding now obscures to some eyes the work of others. But already from the builders goes up to God a grand harmony of praise and Christian life. Let us maintain it. Soon the building will be complete, the scaffolding removed, and the One great Temple will appear, the realised conception of the eternal thought of God, radiant in His light, the everlasting and glorious home of the one family of God.

407. Chapters 15, 45, 46 have introduced us to the fascinating and all-important domain of CHURCH HISTORY. In it we see the revelations given in Nature, to Israel, and in Christ moulding the hearts and lives of men, and shaping the developments of nations, in circumstances most various and differing greatly from our own. This practical outworking of abstract truth learnt from ancient documents both confirms (as in § 124ff) and corrects (as in §§ 400, 402) modern interpretations of the documents, enables us better to grasp their significance, and affords many valuable lessons for the altered

circumstances of our own day. The strange story of the Church, the blending of divine wisdom and power with human weakness and folly and sin, demands and will well repay careful study. Indeed, many controversies, *e.g.* §§ 389, 391, cannot otherwise be understood. Just as a wise man will review his past life, and seek in its lessons guidance for the future, so must the Church of Christ and its members seek instruction in the records which preserve the memory of centuries gone by.

CHAPTER XLVII

THE LORD'S SUPPER: IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

408. ON the night of His arrest, as we read in Mt. 26^{26}, Mk. 14^{22}, Christ took a loaf or cake of bread, broke it, and gave to the twelve saying, "this is My Body:" so Lk. 22^{19}, 1 Cor. 11^{24}, adding, "which is (given) on your behalf: this do for the remembrance of Me." Mt. 26^{28}, Mk. 14^{24}, add that He took a cup, gave thanks (εὐχαριστήσας), and gave it to them saying, "this is My blood of the (New) Covenant which is being poured out, for pardon of sins," or "on behalf of many." Instead of this, Luke and Paul read, "this cup is the New Covenant in My blood," Luke adding "which is being shed on your behalf," and Paul, "this do, so often as ye drink, for the remembrance of Me." The words following (1 Cor. $11^{26\text{-}34}$) imply clearly, as indeed do the other accounts when read in the light of the subsequent history of the Church, that by giving to the apostles bread and wine Christ was ordaining a rite to commemorate for

all time His own approaching violent death. That words equivalent to the above were actually spoken by Christ, is placed beyond doubt by the essential agreement, amid differences in detail, of the testimonies of Paul and of the three evangelists.

That the words of Christ reported above are VERBALLY EXACT, is hardly possible: for it would involve a repetition unsuited to the solemnity of the occasion. The difference between them is unimportant. But Paul's account is in itself the more likely: for, whereas the variation "this is My blood" may be accounted for by the similar words foregoing, "this is My body," the changed form, "this cup is the New Covenant," cannot be accounted for except as genuine. Moreover, we shall see that this change of phrase guards from abuse the words "this is My body." We may therefore give a preference to the account which, in an indisputably genuine epistle, the apostle says that he received from Christ.

409. What did these WORDS MEAN? Not that the bread was actually Christ's own body. Else He would have, at the same time and place, two visible bodies, one consisting of flesh and blood, living and uninjured, the other already broken, consisting of baked flour. The apostles could only understand His words to mean that the bread was SYMBOLIC, and the breaking and distribution of it PROPHETIC, signifying and announcing that the body living before their eyes was to die, for their spiritual nourishment: cp. Isa. $20^{2\text{-}4}$. Just as we point to a picture and say, without fear of being misunderstood, This is my father, or, my house, so the apostles would understand our Lord's words. And their interpretation would be confirmed by the words following. For a "cup" is not a "covenant." But the poured out wine was a prophetic symbol of the blood soon to be shed: and the cup, given and received, was a silent announcement of the covenant

which only the death of Christ made possible. This interpretation, which would naturally suggest itself at once, would be confirmed by the repeated words, "for the remembrance of Me." For the symbol of the broken body and of the covenant ratified in blood would recall forcibly, to those who in after years broke the bread and drank the wine, the memory of Him who died that they might live.

The words "THE NEW COVENANT" in 1 Cor. 11^{25}, Lk. 22^{20} recall at once Jer. 31^{31-34}. All the religious advantages of Israel came from God's *covenant* (Ex. 19^{5}, 24^{7f}) through Moses, and the earlier covenant (Gen. 15^{18}, 17^{4ff}) with Abraham. Jeremiah foretold that in days to come this ancient covenant, so fruitful in blessing to Israel, would be superseded by a better, and that God would then enter into a *new* and more glorious relation to men. In 1 Cor. 11^{25}, Christ announces that this prophecy is at once to be fulfilled: a close coincidence in 2 Cor. 3^{6}. The conspicuous words "in My *blood*" imply that this New Covenant is closely related to His approaching violent *death*.

The above exposition goes far to EXPLAIN everything in the N.T. about the Lord's Supper. Dishonour to the symbols is dishonour to the realities thus set forth, and will bring judgment to him who does not recognise their infinite greatness: 1 Cor. $11^{27, 29}$. That many eat the same bread and drink from the same cup, sets forth and implies the great truth that they share the infinite blessings derived from the bruising of that body and the shedding of that blood. In this real sense, "the cup" is a "partnership of the blood of Christ:" 1 Cor. 10^{16}. This language is the more appropriate because, as expressly commanded by Christ at the most solemn crisis of His life, participation in the Supper is binding upon us, and is therefore a condition of the blessings flowing from His birth and death. To turn away

from the sacred symbols of this pathetic mystery, is therefore to turn away from Him who gave His life that we may have life eternal.

410. Christ's words recall Jno. $6^{33\text{-}59}$, spoken apparently at the same time (*v.*[4]) in the preceding year: but in these last we have no direct reference to the Supper. He is "the Bread of Life:" for just as bread nourishes (and without such nourishment we must die) only by its own destruction, so He gave us life through His own death. And that, in order to give us life, His body must needs be bruised and His blood shed, explains and justifies *v.*[53], "except ye eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of God, ye have no life in you." How we are to eat and drink, *i.e.* to appropriate the results of His death, we learn in *vv.*[35, 40, 47], viz. by coming to Him and believing in Him. We thus gain (*v.*[56]) an inward, spiritual, mutually interpenetrating, contact with Him.

411. We come now to ask, What BENEFITS may we expect from this sacred rite?

As expressly ordained by Christ, it is OBLIGATORY upon us, and therefore a condition of His favour: for we cannot enjoy His smile while we knowingly disobey His word. Moreover, since every act of obedience is a channel of blessing, we may come to the sacred rite with complete confidence that in it Christ will meet with and bless us.

By setting conspicuously before us the broken body and SHED BLOOD of Christ, the Lord's Supper reminds us, in the most forceful and permanent way possible, that Christ laid down His life that we may have eternal life. It is thus a visible and symbolic embodiment of this great and distinctive doctrine: cp. 1 Cor. 11^{26}. To erect in the Church a visible and permanent and conspicuous monument of it, was doubtless a chief aim of this sacred rite. This purpose has been attained. With exceptions too few to mention, in

all Churches the rite has been maintained as the central act of worship: and wherever the rite is performed, the doctrine of salvation through the death of Christ has been firmly held. On the other hand, they who do not hold the doctrine know not what to do with the rite.

Moreover, by bringing Christians together in outward worship, the supper gives formal and VISIBLE UNITY to the service of Christ. Such visible unity was of infinite importance for the continued existence of Christianity in face of the hostile and powerful influences which beset its early course: and we cannot conceive any means so effective for this end as this simple rite. To perpetuate it, and thus give corporate form to His followers, Christ instituted it at the most solemn period of His life; and, by bidding us observe it in remembrance of Himself, made it practically a condition of salvation. Similarly, to give conspicuous permanence to the covenant with Israel, God gave the O.T. ritual.

Moreover, this visible form commanded by Christ compels everyone in Christian circles to take up an outward and visible and personal relation to Christianity and to Christ. For it leaves no alternative except either to obey or disobey His express and simple command. This plain issue is no small gain.

412. Again, the Gospel is the divinely-chosen means of conveying, to those who believe it, the life which results from Christ's death. Now the preached word gives life only through the supernatural presence and agency of Him who is THE SPIRIT OF THE TRUTH, and who breathes life and power into what would otherwise be an empty sound. So must it be with the Truth set forth in the sacred emblems. Therefore, just as in the preached word, in some sense to all who hear it and in the fullest possible sense to those who receive it by faith, we have the real, living, active, objective

presence of the Crucified and Living Saviour, so we need not hesitate to say that in the same sense we have His REAL PRESENCE in the Lord's Supper ; and that this saving presence is conditioned by our faith.

We have already seen that, as expressly commanded by Christ, the Lord's Supper is a condition of His favour and of the blessings bought for us by His death. Now practically we cannot distinguish between a condition performed in order to obtain something depending on it and an instrument with which we lay hold of something we desire. Consequently, we cannot but look upon both faith and the Lord's Supper (both being simply conditions of salvation) as INSTRUMENTS by which we lay HOLD OF CHRIST. We may therefore say correctly, as suggested in 1 Cor. 10^{16}, that by receiving the material elements we become SHARERS OF THE BODY AND BLOOD of Christ : for we thus become partners with Him in all He has and is.

The Lord's Supper is a most searching TEST OF OUR FAITH that Christ is actually and supernaturally present and active in the hearts of His people. Little faith is needed to believe that a preached word may do good : for the connection between the means and end is evident. But, to expect spiritual blessing from material bread and wine, blessing not to be obtained if we neglect the rite, implies reliance on the presence and inward power of Him who fed the 5,000 and made water into wine, and who has promised to be in His people as their life to the end of time and through eternity. Thus the sacramental feast, tests, develops, and testifies our faith in the SUPERNATURAL PRESENCE and activity of Christ in His Church.

413. That Christ commands a BODILY RECEPTION of material bread and wine, gives to these elements a mysterious and unique DIGNITY. (Similarly, God's choice of a spoken word

as a channel of salvation gives to the human voice incomparable dignity.) Since the eating and drinking which Christ requires are material, we may say that His command makes our reception of the spiritual, and ultimately material, benefits purchased by the death of His body and the shedding of His blood conditional on our reception into our own bodies of the material bread and wine. Christ has thus placed these elements of food in unique relation to Himself. Remembering this, as we look at them we may almost forget the material food produced by nature and by human manipulation, and think only of the pierced body and shed blood, without which there had been no bread and no wine on the sacred table, and of the spiritual nourishment we derive therefrom. To the eye of faith, the symbols disappear and the infinite reality alone remains.

414. In the N.T., the Lord's Supper is never called a SACRIFICE. But its connection with the Jewish Passover reminds us that it is in some sense a SACRIFICIAL ACT. The analogy of the Jewish and Christian rites is very close. The former set forth in symbol the truth that man's salvation comes through the death of the innocent: and, as solemnly ordained by God, they were a condition of the benefits of the Old Covenant. Consequently, after disuse in times of spiritual declension, the sacrifices were restored, *e.g.* 2 Chr. 29, in times of revival. Now the Lord's Supper is the one recurring rite of the New Covenant. Of this covenant, a conspicuous benefit is pardon of sins: Mt. 26^{28}, Heb. 8^{12}, cp. Jer. 31^{34}. Therefore, while receiving the Supper in faith, we claim the benefits of the Covenant, and especially the pardon of our sins. We thus present to God, for our sins, in our hearts and by faith, the pierced body and shed blood of Christ: for we hide us beneath His cross from the penalty of our sins. And, while we do so, the blood

of Christ saves us from it: for "in His own blood" Christ becomes through our faith a "propitiation for our sins:" Rom. 3^{25}, 1 Jno. 2^{2}. Thus in the Supper we do a spiritual act analogous to the sprinkling of the blood by the High Priest once a year in the Most Holy Place. But, since we do but present to God as a propitiation for our sins the blood already shed once for all, it is better to call the Supper a sacrificial act rather than a sacrifice.

415. We conclude then that Christ ordained the Supper in order to give great prominence, in the eyes of even the humblest believer, to the great truth that our life comes through His death; also as a means of testing, developing, and confessing to the world, our belief that salvation is an outworking of a power which cannot be explained by, and is altogether above, the laws of mind and morals; and as a means of giving to His people corporate and visible unity in face of the world. In order to secure, to the end of time, the observance of the rite by all His followers, and thus to secure the aims just mentioned, Christ made the Supper, by expressly commanding it, an indispensable condition of salvation. And, since in the Kingdom of God there are no useless conditions, He determined to make it a channel through which, by His own presence and activity, He would pour the spiritual benefits therein set forth. We infer that, as in the preached so in the symbolic word, the designed benefits are received only by those who believe. And, since unbelief, or an evil motive in those who partake the Supper, implies resistance to the truths therein set forth and great dishonour to Him who died even for those who reject Him, we infer that, to those who misuse it for their own base ends, the sacred rite brings condemnation.

416. Touching the MODE OF CELEBRATING the Supper, we have in the N.T. no precise directions. But the warning

in 1 Cor. 11[20-22] reveals the great difference between the primitive mode of celebration and that of later ages.

Evidently the excesses at Corinth occurred at the Lord's Supper. For the "Lord's Supper" in *v.*[20] can be no other than "the bread" and "the cup of the Lord" in *v.*[27]. And the argument in *v.*[21], viz. that to take beforehand each his own supper made it impossible for the meal to be the Lord's Supper, implies that the food thus taken was not merely eaten in connection with the sacred symbols, but was actually that food and drink which ought to be received by all together as a supper provided by Christ. This proof is confirmed by the solemn warning in *v.*[27], supporting the reproof in *v.*[22], that they who eat and drink unworthily are guilty of the body and blood of Christ. This warning, Paul applies expressly in *v.*[33] to the abuses at Corinth. We therefore cannot accept the opinion of Chrysostom and others that these abuses occurred at a SEMI-SPIRITUAL REPAST connected with the Lord's Supper.

That private members were able at Corinth to appropriate beforehand the food designed for the communion, implies that they were not in the habit of receiving the bread and wine from the CHURCH-OFFICERS. That Paul did not reprove them for this, and did not even recommend it, although it would have effectually prevented the abuses in question, proves that he did not look upon reception of the elements from the church-officers as essential to the VALIDITY of the rite. This is confirmed by the absence of any censure on the church-officers who, if the distribution of the sacred symbols had been committed to them only, would have been chiefly to blame. From this we infer with certainty that when Christ ordained the Supper He did not direct, and that when 1 Cor. was written the apostles had not directed, that the sacred rite should be administered only by the church-officers. Nor

have we in the N.T. any hint that the apostles afterwards gave this direction. It therefore cannot claim undoubted apostolic authority.

It is however worthy of note that, when Christ ordained the Supper, the APOSTLES ONLY (Mt. 26^{20}) were present. He thus placed the sacred rite in their hands; and probably gave them instructions about its future celebration. But, what these were, we have no means of knowing. This absence of written instructions left to the Church in future ages, guided by the Spirit of God, to determine how best to obey His recorded words.

417. On the administration of the rite in the 2nd cent., light is shed by JUSTIN, 1st *Apology* § 65. "After the prayers, we greet one another with a kiss. Then there is brought to the leader of the brethren (τῷ προεστῶτι τῶν ἀδελφῶν) a cup of water and mixed *wine* (κράματος): and he, having taken it, gives praise and glory to the Father of the universe through the name of His Son and the Holy Spirit, and to some length makes thanksgiving for having been counted worthy of these things from Him. When he has finished the prayers and the thanksgiving all the people present confirm them by saying, Amen. The deacons, as we call them, give to each of those present to partake of the bread, wine, and water, over which thanks has been given; and for those not present we take them to their houses." Also Tertullian, *On the Soldier's Crown* ch. 3: "the sacrament of the Eucharist, we receive from the hands of none but of those who preside."

This practice became nearly or quite universal in the early Church, and has continued to our day. It cannot claim DIVINE AUTHORITY. But its wide acceptance claims respect: and this is confirmed by the appropriateness of receiving the sacred emblems directly or indirectly from the pastor from

whom the members of the flock receive from time to time the bread of life. As a matter of church-order, we do well to maintain this ancient custom.

CHAPTER XLVIII

THE LORD'S SUPPER: MODERN OPINIONS

418. ABOUT the Lord's Supper, THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH teaches, together with much important Gospel truth, that "in the sacrament of the most holy Eucharist is contained truly, really, and substantially the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity, of our Lord Jesus Christ, and accordingly the entire Christ;" that "grace is conferred by sacraments of this kind always and to all so far as God is concerned, if they receive them with correct ritual" (*si rite ea suscipiant*); and that "by consecration of the bread and wine there takes place a conversion of the entire substance of the bread into the substance of the body of our Lord Christ and of the entire substance of the wine into the substance of His blood. This conversion is conveniently and appropriately called TRANSUBSTANTIATION:" *Council of Trent* session xiii. canon 1; s. vii. can. 7; s. xiii. ch. 4. The Roman Church guards this doctrine by teaching that the entire Christ is present both in the consecrated bread and in the wine: s. xxi. ch. 3.

But no hint is given, in the words of Christ or of Paul, of any change in the substance of the consecrated symbols. Indeed, even after the blessing we read in 1 Cor. 11^{26}, "eat this bread." The words "this cup is the New Covenant" warn us not to infer such change from the words, "this is My

body:" and Paul's argument following is complete without it. Had there been such change, it could hardly have been unmentioned. Moreover, it would be an unmeaning and useless miracle. For we distinguish and name objects around from the impression they make on our senses. To this, Christ appeals in Lk. 24^{39}, Jno. 20^{27}. Such an unmeaning miracle certainly demands clear evidence. The only evidence adduced by the Roman Church is an appeal to its own authority as a divinely-appointed teacher in things divine. But we have seen in § 400 that this claim also is destitute of adequate evidence. A doctrine so unlikely, thus destitute of evidence, we must dismiss as not coming within the range of intelligent theology.

Yet it contains an element of truth. The Christian life is from beginning to end supernatural, breathed into and maintained in man by the Spirit, and enabling him to live a nobler life, in defiance of inward evil influences against which his own moral strength is of no avail. Many devout Roman Catholics prefer to worship Christ as present in a consecrated wafer and able to save, rather than accept teaching which excludes Him from the world He has created. In this preference, all godly men will join them. But the true alternative is not between a real presence and a real absence, but between a presence conditioned by the ministrant's ordination by a bishop obedient to the bishop of Rome and a presence conditioned only by the recipient's faith in Him who promised "I am with you always, even to the completion of the age."

419. THE LUTHERAN CHURCH is fairly represented as follows in the *Apology for the Confession of Augsburg* art. 10, *On the Lord's Supper*: "We defend the opinion received in the entire Church that in the Lord's Supper the body and blood of Christ are truly and substantially present, and are truly offered

with those things that appear, viz. with the bread and wine." So Kahnis, *Lutherische Dogmatik* § 21[6]: "Luther's teaching is this. When Christ said, Take, eat: this is My body which is given for you, He said, in the form of syndoké, That which I give you to eat is My body which is given for you, *i.e.* is here imparted to you, for the forgiveness of sins, *i.e.* as sign, warrant, and medium, of the forgiveness of sins for believing receivers. According to the conception of a sacrament, which is a visible word, the chief matter in the Lord's Supper is the word of the forgiveness of sins. Thereby the promise of the Lord's Supper is suspended on the condition of faith. But independent of faith is the reception of the body of Christ, which in, with, and under the bread and wine is distributed." Luther rejected Transubstantiation. But he and the Lutheran Church assert strongly that Christ is locally present in the bread and wine; and is thus received, as Saviour or as Judge, by all who receive the sacred symbols. This opinion is suitably called CONSUBSTANTIATION.

In proof that in the Lord's Supper Christ is actually received (to their condemnation) even by unbelievers, Lutherans appeal to the arguments in 1 Cor. 10[16.17], 11[27-29]. But it is always perilous to assume an important doctrine not expressly taught in the Bible simply because it seems to be implied in an argument there. That Paul's argument does not involve this doctrine, I have above endeavoured to show, and still more so in my *Commentary*. Moreover, in the N.T. Christ is never said to be spiritually present except to bless. And, although His words imply a real and special presence of Christ in the sacred ordinance, they do not imply His local presence in the bread and wine and in the stomachs of those who receive them. Thus the Lutheran doctrine falls to the ground. Its advocates appeal only to the Bible: and the Bible does not teach it.

420. In extreme opposition to the Roman and Lutheran Churches, ZWINGLI taught (see Confession to Charles V. art. 7) "I believe, indeed I know, that all the sacraments are so far from conferring grace that they do not even distribute it;" and that the Lord's Supper is nothing but a mode of recalling the death of Christ and of confessing faith in Him. That this falls far short of the great and solemn significance of the rite, I have already shown. Yet we need not wonder that to this extreme and rationalistic view Zwingli was driven by the assumptions of the papacy.

421. CALVIN asserted (*e.g. Instit.* bk. iv. 17^{10}) in opposition to Zwingli the supernatural and life-giving presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper, making the ordinance to be a special channel of spiritual blessing; and, in opposition to Luther, denied His local presence in the bread and wine, and asserted that only those who receive the elements with faith thereby receive Christ. His teaching has been accepted, in the main, by the REFORMED Churches of Europe. Similarly the THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES of Religion of the Church of England, A.D. 1562, art. 28: "The Supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another, but rather it is a sacrament of our redemption by Christ's death: insomuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith receive the same, the bread which we break is a partaking of the body of Christ, and likewise the cup of blessing is a partaking of the blood of Christ. Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of bread and wine) in the Supper of the Lord cannot be proved by Holy Writ, but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a sacrament, and hath given great occasion to many superstitions. The body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the Supper only after a heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the body of Christ is

received and eaten in the Supper is faith." This seems to me to agree in the main with the teaching of Christ and of Paul.

But the only meaning I can give to the words, "the body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the Supper," is that our partaking of it is a condition of our receiving the spiritual benefits resulting from His incarnation and death: and, to express this meaning, these words seem to me inappropriate and misleading.

422. The DIFFERENCES between the Roman, Lutheran, and Reformed teaching, as discussed above, are NOT SO GREAT as at first sight they appear; and are indeed rather verbal than real. Many godly Roman Catholics cling to transubstantiation as being the strongest protest they can make against prevalent materialism. Zwingli, in his strong rebound from papal assumptions, held fast the divine institution and perpetual obligation of the sacred feast. Luther and the Roman Church assert that, though all who receive the Lord's Supper therein receive Christ, it nevertheless depends upon themselves whether Christ comes into them to save or to condemn: and Calvin taught that, even to those who receive it unworthily, the Lord's Supper has terrible reality, as condemnation.

The serious difference is that the Roman Church claims for its ministers the SOLE RIGHT to distribute the symbols which Christ commands His servants to receive, and asserts that the spiritual validity of the rite depends upon the obedience of the ministrant to the Roman See. Now this last requires, before the distribution of the bread, which only it gives to the laity, CONFESSION to a priest, and such confession as shall satisfy the priest: so *Council of Trent* session xiii. *On the Eucharist* ch. 7; s. xiv. *On Penitence* ch. 6. By this claim the Roman Church puts itself practically between

the sinner and Christ; and claims virtually, for the support of its authority, the very solemn words of Christ and of Paul about the Supper. While recognising our deep obligation to that Church for preserving the light of Christianity, often obscured but still burning, during the long night of the dark ages, I am compelled to believe that the claim of the Roman hierarchy to be the sole ordinary depositary of the benefits symbolized and conveyed by the Supper has been not only a yoke hard to bear and needless, but directly and indirectly a source of terrible and wide-spread evil.

Fortunately this claim rests on no adequate foundation. In § 416 we saw that neither Christ nor His apostles, so far as we know, gave to the officers of the Church an exclusive right to distribute the elements. They preferred to risk the abuses mentioned in 1 Cor. 11^{21f}: and, even when these abuses had arisen, Paul refrained from limiting the distribution of the elements to the church-officers, rather than permit sacerdotal assumptions to have the smallest foothold in his writings. The only foundation left for the Roman claim to a monopoly of a valid ministration of the sacred rite is its general claim to a monopoly of the blessings of the New Covenant, a claim without foundation, and disproved in the hearts of millions by the spiritual life of the Protestant Churches: see § 400.

423. The priestly monopoly of the administration of the Supper is claimed for the ANGLICAN CHURCH by not a few of its members. But this claim, invalid even when made for the ancient Church of the West, becomes ridiculous when made for a communion which, under lay compulsion, revolted from a Church of which it was formerly a part: see § 395. This revolt was abundantly justified by the serious errors into which nearly all Anglicans believe that the Roman Church had fallen: and it has been an infinite gain to our nation.

But indisputably it destroys all claim to a monopoly of the legitimate administration of the Lord's Supper. Moreover this unwarranted claim to spiritual monopoly is, in my view, the greatest hindrance in England and Wales to the work of God. For it divides the family of God into two camps more or less hostile, and compels many who wish to co-operate with all the servants of Christ in all good things to look upon others of His servants as their opponents.

CHAPTER XLIX

ON BAPTISM

424. THE silence of centuries was suddenly broken, ages ago, on the banks of the Jordan by the fearless voice of a prophet of strange dress and bearing. For the first time in living memory, crowds hung on the lips of a religious teacher. While much that he said was in the strain of the ancient prophets, one thing was new, and so distinctive as to give to the stranger his most common and enduring designation. He was JOHN THE BAPTIZER.

The religious use of WATER was already familiar: Ex. $30^{17\text{-}21}$, Num. $19^{11\text{-}22}$, Sirach 34^{25}, Mk. 7^{4}. These ceremonial purifications moulded the language of much O.T. teaching; and the prophets foretold complete purification of the inner life: *e.g.* Ps. 51^{7}, Isa. 1^{15f}; Ezek. 36^{25}, Zech. 13^{1}. All this, the baptism of John would recall.

With baptism was associated CONFESSION of sin: Mt. 3^{6}. By submitting to the rite, the baptized acknowledged that the sins he confessed were a stain needing to be cleansed

away: and, that the rite was never self-administered, but always received from one who claimed to be sent by God or possibly from some one acting under his direction, taught plainly that the sinner needs a purification beyond his own power. John also announced the approach of a Baptizer greater than himself, and of a baptism not with water but with the Holy Spirit: cp. Joel 2^{28f}.

The baptized became, and were known as, "disciples of John:" Jno. 3^{25}, 4^{1}. Some remained such even after the appearance of Jesus: Mt. 9^{14}, 11^{2}. But we have no proof that they were formed into an organized society.

425. Soon after JESUS appeared, He began to baptize, chiefly through the hands of His disciples: Jno. 3^{22}, 4^{2}. After His resurrection He charged the apostles to bring all the nations to His feet as learners, and while so doing to baptize them and to teach them whatever He had commanded: Mt. 28^{19f}. The accompanying promise implies that the rite was designed to continue "to the completion of the age." Very similar is Mk. 16^{16}, where baptism is linked with faith as a condition of salvation. The absolute rigour of this second condition is somewhat softened by its absence from the second clause. In view of this implied command, (cp. Acts 2^{38},) thousands have received the sacred rite at great cost and peril. They have dared thus to confess Christ in joyful confidence that He will confess them before His Father in heaven: Mt. 10^{32}.

Why did Christ, in full view of the tremendous loss and peril it would in many cases involve, require this FORMAL CONFESSION? A partial answer is not far to seek. He ordained and required the outward rite of baptism, in order that His service might take visible form before men and present to the world a united front, and in order that His servants might recognise each other and thus be able to stand

shoulder to shoulder in the great conflict strengthened by mutual counsel and encouragement. Similarly, among other reasons, Christ ordained the *Supper*, the one *recurrent* rite of His Church, in order to maintain in it unity, and the strength of unity.

426. We understand now Acts 22^{16}. By ordaining and commanding baptism, Christ made it a CONDITION of the salvation He proclaimed. Therefore, for the repentant persecutor there was no forgiveness and purification except by formal confession of Christ in baptism; and, as a condition performed in order to attain a result dependent on it, Ananias here speaks of baptism as a means of salvation. The middle voice *baptize-thyself* reminds us that in his baptism Saul was himself the most conspicuous actor: similarly 2 Cor. 7^{1}, 1 Jno. 3^{3}. We must, by faith and confession, ourselves claim the purification which the Spirit works in those who believe; and in this sense purify ourselves. "The bath of the new birth" in Tit. 3^{5} is probably baptism. The words following imply that Paul and Titus were "born from water and Spirit." These last words, from Jno. 3^{5}, remind us that, even for an old and influential Pharisee, there was no way into the Kingdom of God except through the confession of baptism. The "water" is put first possibly as being to Nicodemus his chief obstacle to salvation. It is mentioned only once, the "Spirit" three times, because He is the active Agent, and baptism only a condition, of the new birth. In Gal. $3^{26, 27}$, Col. 2^{12}, faith and baptism are connected: cp. Rom. 6^{4}. From Acts $10^{47, 48}$ we learn that baptism was needful even for those who had received the Holy Spirit. In 1 Cor. 12^{13}, the word *baptized* refers probably to baptism by water, as the outward and visible gate into the Church. In 1 Pet. 3^{21}, as a condition, and in this sense an instrument, of salvation, we read, "baptism saves you."

Throughout the N.T., baptism is the formal and VISIBLE GATE into the company of the professed followers of Christ, a gate erected by Him as, for them, the only way of salvation: and this explains a few passages, noted above, where it is spoken of as not only a condition, but a means, of salvation.

427. Baptism is much more than a divinely-appointed mode of confessing Christ. In baptism, a new convert is received into its fold by the already-existing Church, without which there had been no preached word, no faith, no convert, and no confession of faith. Now the Church rests on the great historic fact that in Christ God has come near to man and entered into definite engagement to give him certain good things on certain conditions From this NEW COVENANT flow all the blessings received through Christ by faith: and the objective reality of the Covenant is of infinitely greater importance than the faith or confession of any one baptized person.

At the baptism of Saul of Tarsus, to the onlookers, his own personal act and confession would be the most conspicuous element of the rite: but to the baptized, as he came humbly and passive to receive it, the all-absorbing thought would be that the ancient promises were now fulfilled, and that in Jesus of Nazareth, whom he had persecuted, a fountain had been opened for sin and uncleanness, and that in Him a New Covenant had been set up between God and man. By recalling the objective and historical fact of that New Covenant, baptism was a divinely-erected monument of it.

428. This second view of baptism is strongly confirmed by God's words in Gen. 17^{10-14} when ordaining CIRCUMCISION as a "sign of the covenant" and a condition of the blessings therein promised. Each rite was on the one hand a visible monument of the great fact that God had entered into covenant with man, and on the other hand a formal and

personal acknowledgment of loyalty to God, an acknowledgment required by God as a condition of His favour.

A second analogy is found in the LORD'S SUPPER, the only other outward rite ordained by Christ for all His servants, of which He said, in close agreement with Gen. 17^{10}, "this cup is the New Covenant." Circumcision and the Supper were visible monuments of the all-important historic facts that in Abraham and in Christ God had come near to man and placed him in special relation to Himself.

In view then of its relation to circumcision and to the Lord's Supper, we cannot doubt that also baptism was designed to be a VISIBLE MONUMENT of the New Covenant. That Christ erected TWO such monuments, need not surprise us: for the fact thus commemorated is infinitely the greatest in human history. In each case, truth is set forth in symbolic form. The one stands at the entrance to the Christian life, and reminds us that they only can come to God whose hearts have been cleansed from the stain of sin, with a cleansing beyond their own power but wrought by Christ in all who believe the Gospel. The other symbolic rite is recurrent along the whole way to heaven, and reminds us that the covenant blessings come through the blood and death of Christ and that only from His pierced body and shed blood do we derive the nutriment needful for our daily spiritual life.

429. Baptism then has a DOUBLE SIGNIFICANCE. It is (1) a divinely-erected monument of the New Covenant symbolizing the purification therein required and promised; and (2) a divinely-erected gate through which Jews and heathens entered the company of the professed followers of Christ. Either of these aspects may for the moment claim chief or sole attention. So in Rom. 4^{11} Paul calls Abraham's circumcision "a seal of the faith which he had while yet uncircumcised," passing for the moment by the main significance of the rite as asserted

by God at its institution, in Gen. 17^{10f}. But his view of the rite, though not suggested in Genesis, was a legitimate inference from the narrative there; and bore directly on the matter Paul had in hand, viz. the analogy between Abraham's faith and faith in Christ. The other aspect had no such bearing, and was therefore passed over in silence. So we, looking at baptism as set forth in the N.T., thought of it first as a confession of faith and a condition of salvation. Our second thought saw in it a profounder significance, viz. that without purity none can serve God aright and that God has pledged Himself to give the purity He requires. As administered by the Church, baptism represents what God requires and waits to give: as received by the individual, it represents man's appropriation of the offered blessings. It thus reflects two aspects of the covenant of which it is a sign and seal; and links together God and man.

CHAPTER L

THE BAPTISM OF INFANTS

430. IN strange contrast to the N.T. picture of baptism, in nearly all modern Churches, as a mode of confessing faith by the baptized, it is practically superseded by the administration of the rite to infants INCAPABLE OF CONFESSION OR FAITH. This contrast demands our best attention.

The N.T. says nothing about the baptism of infants. It is not suggested by the three BAPTIZED HOUSEHOLDS in 1 Cor. 1^{16}, Acts $16^{15, 33}$: for in Jno. 4^{53}, Acts 10^{2}, 16^{34}, 18^{8}, 1 Cor. 16^{15} we have five believing or godly households. This

does not mean that there were no infants or that they believed; but only that all capable of understanding the Gospel believed it. Just so, the early readers of the N.T. knew whether it was usual to baptize infants. If it was, they would infer that, if in these three families there were infants, they were baptized: if not, that all of suitable age were baptized. On such uncertain inferences, we cannot safely build theological conclusions. Nor can we on 1 Cor. 7^{14}; where, if the "children are holy," the unbelieving "husband is sanctified:" see my *Commentary*.

In baptism, an infant is absolutely passive; whereas a believer is himself the most conspicuous actor. So great is this difference that two great passages on baptism, Gal. $3^{26, 27}$, Col. 2^{12}, are ALTOGETHER INAPPLICABLE to infant baptism. Moreover, other passages, *e.g.* Acts 22^{16}, if applied to infants, introduce an element utterly alien to the spirit of the Gospel: see § 445.

431. In spite of all this, in the former part of the 3rd cent., infant baptism was apparently GENERAL and UNDISPUTED. Cyprian (*Letter* 58^2, or 64^2) speaks of a council which agreed unanimously that baptism need not be deferred to the eighth day. This proves that about the general question of baptizing infants there was then in North Africa no doubt whatever. Similarly, Origen, *Homilies on Leviticus* 8^3, "by the practice of the Church baptism is given to little ones:" *On Luke* 14, "because by baptism the impurities of birth are laid aside, for this reason also little ones are baptized." So also his *Commentary on Romans* bk. 5^9: "the Church has received a tradition from the apostles that baptism be given to little ones." These works exist only in a Latin translation: but their united testimony may be accepted with confidence as expressing the opinion of Origen. The EARLIEST definite MENTION of infant baptism is by Tertullian, *On Baptism* ch. 18.

He opposes the practice, not on the ground of novelty, or as a matter of principle, but as inexpedient; and thus bears witness to its prevalence. Apparently it arose unobserved and without protest: and in all ages it has been the custom of a large majority of the universal Church.

432. What then shall we say? Some urge that the practice of the MAJORITY in all lands and all ages ought to determine our own conduct; and that the manifest blessing of God resting equally during long centuries upon those who baptize infants and those who baptize only believers disproves utterly the suggestion that the former are neglecting, and only the latter are duly observing, the ordinance of Christ. This argument, which is by no means without force, I cannot accept as decisive. For the many complications of the Christian life make the apparent favour of God a very uncertain standard of the truth of the doctrines believed by those on whom He seems to smile. In § 447 we shall be compelled to reject a doctrine accepted for ages by an almost unanimous consent of all Churches. At the same time a general consent of Christian belief always demands respectful attention. Almost always widely-accepted doctrines and practices contain important elements of truth, even though possibly these may be obscured by serious error.

Others say that we have nothing to do with the practice and belief of POST-APOSTOLIC ages; that, inasmuch as infant baptism practically supersedes the baptism of believers, the only form of the rite mentioned in the N.T., and thus modifies the ordinance of Christ, we are bound to reject it and baptize only believers. This judgment, I cannot accept. Even a doctrine is not disproved by absence of explicit statement in the Bible. We ask whether or not it is a fair and logical inference from doctrines which we can trace by decisive evidence to the lips of Christ or the pen of apostles

or evangelists; or contradicts their teaching: and according to our answer we accept or reject it, or through lack of evidence suspend our judgment. So, with forms of worship, we ask, not whether they are prescribed in the N.T., but whether they are in harmony with its spirit, and serve a good purpose.

It would be easy to RETORT that we have in the N.T. no example of a congregation under the charge of a single pastor, as is almost universal in Baptist Churches. The reply would be that the single pastorate is a legitimate modification of the N.T. church-order; that it contradicts no command of Christ; and that it has suited, and supplied the needs of, many churches, and works well for them to-day. Therefore, though not prescribed in the N.T., it is a LEGITIMATE DEVELOPMENT of church life, a development in harmony with its history and circumstances. Another example of such evolution is given in § 466. The Gospel is a life, not a prescription. We have no proof that the Christian life assumed at once all forms needful for its full development: nor have we proof that all early forms were designed to continue unmodified to the end of time. We therefore cannot ignore the Christianity of nineteen centuries and begin to re-erect the Church, with the N.T. as a working plan.

433. For an answer to the question, Whom shall we baptize? we turn now to the great COMMISSION in Mt. 28^{19}. The chief command, in the imperative mood, is "make-to-be-disciples," *i.e.* bring to My feet as learners, "all the nations;" these last being the direct object of the verb. Not baptisms but converts are the main purpose of the command. Then follow two present participles describing actions contemporary with the main verb, (1) "*baptizing* them," *i.e.* "the nations," and (2) "*teaching* them etc." From Acts $2^{38, 41}$ we learn how

the apostles obeyed this command. At Pentecost, Peter bade his hearers "repent and be baptized:" and 3000 were baptized. The obligation to be baptized, involved in Mt. 28^{19}, is confirmed by Mk. 16^{16}, in what is probably a very early addition to the 2nd Gospel, "he that believes and is baptized shall be saved: but he that believes not shall be condemned." Necessarily the earliest to be baptized were believers; and we have no proof or suggestion that their children were baptized with them. For the Gospel is an announcement of personal salvation to be appropriated by each one's own faith.

Do the words "all the nations" include little children? This question would soon arise. For, in religion, family life holds a large place: and indisputably children who will hear from their parents the story of the Cross stand in a relation to God very different from that of those taken to a heathen temple. They have greater privileges and greater responsibilities.

434. This differencé received conspicuous recognition under the Old Covenant. By express and emphatic command of God, Jewish children bore in their bodies the sign of the covenant made by God with Abraham: Gen. $17^{12\text{-}14}$. Moreover, the CIRCUMCISION OF INFANTS almost superseded that of believers, leaving this last only for proselytes. So great is the difference that Paul's words in Rom. 4^{11} about the circumcision of Abraham are altogether inapplicable to infants. The circumcision of ISAAC differs as widely from that of ABRAHAM, and in the same respects, as does the baptism of an INFANT from that of a BELIEVER.

We reverently ask, Why did God bid Isaac to be circumcised, thus modifying so greatly the significance of the rite? Faith was as needful for Isaac as for Abraham: for the father's faith cannot save his son. Why not defer the rite till it can be a seal of Isaac's own faith? What greater benefit had God

in view to compensate, in the case of Isaac, for the loss of a part of the significance of the circumcision of Abraham? I venture to suggest that the designed benefit was to emphasize the infinite importance of FAMILY LIFE as a means of helping forward the Kingdom of God; and to teach that God claims human life from the earliest dawn of intelligence, and has laid upon parents the duty of training their children for the service of God. So great and solemn is the responsibility thus resting on parents and children that we wonder not at its formal recognition and embodiment, by the express command of God, in the circumcision of infants. The element of personal confession was maintained when each father brought his infant son to be circumcised, thus recognising the claim of God. Undoubtedly the circumcision of infants, even though it superseded the circumcision of believers, was a great religious gain to the nation. For it not only sanctified family life but recalled, as the only explanation of the rite, the story of God's covenant with Abraham in the day he believed: Gen. 15^{18}. In each form of the rite, its radical significance, asserted in Gen. 17^{11}, was maintained, viz. as a "sign of the covenant" between God and Abraham. The further significance expounded in Rom. 4^{11} was a legitimate inference from the narrative in Genesis.

435. All this applies equally to baptism. In each case, the MODIFIED RITE can be understood only in the light of its original form: and in each case the primary significance, as expounded by God at the institution of circumcision, remains unimpaired. In each case the modification embodies important truth, viz. the RELATION OF CHILDREN TO the GOD of their fathers, an important element common to both covenants. In infant baptism, this truth is suitably recognised. If it be not thus recognised, the New Covenant is in this important point defective as compared with the Old.

It has been suggested that this defect might be supplied by a special dedicatory rite for infants. Attempts to introduce such a service have not been very successful. Moreover, the relation of the children of Christian parents to the New Covenant can be satisfactorily set forth only by erecting in infancy the sign of the Covenant, in token that, apart from his own action or choice, the child is placed by his birth under its solemn responsibilities.

436. We turn again to Christ's command to BAPTIZE and teach ALL THE NATIONS. Adults, we can baptize and teach only as they are willing to profess themselves Christ's disciples. But little ones are under their parents' control. There is therefore nothing to prevent their baptism and instruction. And there is nothing in Christ's command to forbid it: for indisputably they belong to "the nations." We have seen that to administer the rite to them involves no loss, except as supplied in §§ 441, 443, and brings great spiritual gain: this gain is to us a sufficient indication of the will of Christ. We therefore baptize them, believing that in so doing we obey His command in the form He would most approve.

437. By bringing their infants to Christ (Mt. $19^{13\text{-}15}$, Mk. $10^{13\text{-}16}$, Lk. $18^{15\text{-}17}$) some Jewish MOTHERS testified their faith that all human life, from its earliest beginning, was dear to Christ, and that children were included in His purpose of mercy and stand in definite relation to the New Covenant. By receiving and blessing their little ones, Christ accepted and rewarded their faith. The same faith finds expression in infant baptism. In thus bringing our little ones to Christ, we do but intimate an action which He permitted and defended.

438. TO SUM UP. We baptize, because Christ bade His apostles, while bringing all nations into His school as learners, to baptize them. This command, we can obey, with adults, only as they are willing to accept the teaching and rule of

Christ: but infants are under their parents' control. We therefore baptize them as the best way known to us of obeying His command. In each case, baptism is a visible sign of the New Covenant, and sets before us the great truth that God claims in those who approach Him, and will give to all who ask Him, inward purity. The baptism of infants sets forth also that God claims, and smiles upon, human life from its earliest dawn. This great truth was set forth in the circumcision of infants. Therefore, in the absence of any express command or of any intimation to the contrary, we administer the corresponding Christian rite in such way as to embody this truth; thus following the practice of a great majority in the universal Church. We bring our little ones to the sacred rite, thus presenting them to God as like ourselves needing a purity which only He can give, "nothing doubting that He favourably alloweth this godly work of ours in bringing this infant to His holy baptism."

439. The BENEFIT of baptism is now evident. Just as, in the Law and the Gospel, revealed Truth is presented to the mind in audible words, so in baptism and the Lord's Supper, in circumcision and the O.T. ritual, saving truth is presented to the mind in VISIBLE SYMBOLS. The word explains the symbol: the symbol, more easily preserved than is abstract teaching, calls attention to the explanatory word. Each embodies the historic fact that God has come near to man and has entered into covenant with him. The Supper teaches in silent eloquence that this covenant rests mysteriously on the death of Christ: baptism teaches that, in the covenant, God requires and imparts a PURITY otherwise beyond man's reach. The Spirit of the Truth opens our hearts rightly to interpret the symbols and to receive the truth therein embodied, and gives to this last its saving power.

440. To these important truths, the baptism of infants adds the truth that even the INNOCENCE OF CHILDHOOD needs purification at the hands of God, that the children of Christian parents are from their earliest days encompassed by the New Covenant, and that, whatever their future action or choice may be, they will be treated by God on the principles of the Covenant. In other words, Christ claims our little ones for His own: and from that claim their subsequent action, be it what it may, cannot release them. This claim involves a THREEFOLD RESPONSIBILITY resting on the children, on their parents, and on the Church.

The rite reminds us (1) that, BEFORE WE WERE BORN, for us had been shed the blood of the Covenant; that around our opening intelligence shone the light of the Gospel, which must be to us either the light of life or a consuming fire; and that from loving lips in early days we heard the story of the Cross, which must be to us either an eternal song or eternal shame. Far different our lot, had we been born in the darkness of heathendom. This difference, with its vast responsibilities, the baptism of infants sets before us.

It also embodies a responsibility resting (2) on their PARENTS. The constant intercourse at home, the dependence of the child upon his parents for the necessaries and comforts of life, and the love evoked by parental care, give to parents a unique influence, and a unique opportunity of leading their little ones to bow to Christ. To use to the uttermost this opportunity, every parent is bound by his loyalty to Christ, by his love to his children, and by the solemn responsibilities resting upon them. Indeed, the training of children to serve the God of their fathers was, I doubt not, one chief aim of the institution by the Creator of the parental relation.

A similar responsibility rests on (3) the CHURCH, and especially on Christian PASTORS. The susceptibility of child-

hood affords an opportunity, soon to pass away, of winning children for Christ; and thus creates a corresponding responsibility. Every church and every pastor, and in some measure every Christian man and woman, is bound to do all he can to bring to Christ all the children within his influence. When parents bring an infant to baptism, they thus claim for him in due time RELIGIOUS OVERSIGHT by the pastor and a share of the religious advantages afforded by the Church. This opens to him and to the Church an opportunity of doing good to the child, and thus lays upon them increased responsibilities.

The embodiment, in baptism, of the infant's relation to the New Covenant is the most SUITABLE we can conceive. No one asked the little one whether he would be baptized: nor did God ask him whether he would be born in a Christian family. Yet, by the responsibilities following inevitably the surroundings of his birth, he will be judged. Unstained as he is by personal sin, he yet needs a purification which only God can give, as time will soon show. But this holy rite tells us that, before the innate tendencies to evil reveal themselves, God has already provided the needed purification.

441. Along with these benefits is a conspicuous DEFECT in the baptism of infants as compared with that of believers, viz. the lack of personal faith and confession.[1] Indisputably baptism does not put an unconscious infant in the position of a baptized believer. The rite has been administered in hope: but the hope still awaits realisation.

This difference is often seen on the FOREIGN MISSION FIELD. Few scenes are more solemn than the baptism of a Hindu convert, who by accepting baptism breaks away definitely from the heathenism of his earlier days and enters the company of the professed followers of Christ. Some time afterwards, an equally solemn ceremony follows. The Hindu

father brings his infant son to receive the sacred rite he has himself so recently received; thus recognising that the God who has saved the father claims, and is ready to receive and bless, his unconscious infant. In the former service, we thought of a brave man's personal decision: we think now of the infinite spiritual advantages derived from that decision by the brave man's child, with earnest prayer that in due time he may follow in his father's steps.

Years pass. The infant has become a young man: taught by his father, he bows to Christ; and is to-day formally received into the Church. He now occupies a relation to God, to the New Covenant, and to the Church, precisely the same as that entered by his father at baptism. He belongs now to the company of the professed servants of Christ, and claims all the blessings of the New Covenant. The only difference is that, whereas the father's baptism took place at his confession of faith, the son's baptism took place in infancy. In other words, the subsequent confession of faith and formal reception into the Church are a realisation of the hope which inspired the baptism of the infant and a completion of a service otherwise incomplete.

442. This example warns us that baptized infants are not MEMBERS OF THE CHURCH in the same sense as are professed believers. They who have not yet entered the battle of life do not occupy the position of those who have already gained a most important victory. Born as they are under the light of the Gospel, they can enter the company of the servants of Christ only through the gate of personal faith and confession. To overlook this difference, cannot raise the little ones: it will inevitably lower our conception of the Church. If it obscure the absolute need, in our children, of personal faith and confession, it will greatly injure them.

Yet the children of Christian parents, and those in Christian congregations and schools, though not, in the full sense, members of the Church, occupy already a very close relation to it. They are in an OUTER COURT, separated from the inner sanctuary only by the gate of personal confession. Very soon they must either pass through that gate or wander away into the world. To-day they are within reach of our influence: in a few years it will be displaced by the distracting influences of the world around. The value and the shortness of this opportunity lays upon the Christian pastor heavy responsibility. He is bound to use every effort to lead the little ones, as early as possible, from the outer court into the sanctuary of personal confession.

443. By baptizing infants, the Church recognises Christ's claim to the little ones, and binds itself to use all suitable means to lead them in early life to put faith in Christ, and by public confession to join the company of His servants. In most Churches, by the rite of confirmation or otherwise, provision is made for this PERSONAL and formal CONFESSION. In order that it may be a reality worthy of the solemn occasion, the formal confession should always be preceded by earnest efforts to WIN FOR CHRIST the hearts of these lambs of His Flock, and by careful INSTRUCTION about the great saving truths revealed by Christ, and about the path along which He would have them go. But all details must be left to the wisdom of each Church, guided by the Spirit of God. Such earnest and systematic efforts to save and instruct, and such public confession, are a needful SUPPLEMENT to the rite of infant baptism. Without such subsequent persuasion and teaching, we have no right to baptize infants.

CHAPTER LI

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION: MODE OF BAPTISM THE TWO SACRAMENTS

444. Oversight of the difference between infant baptism and the baptism of believers gave rise to a most serious error prevalent from the 4th cent. to our own time, and known as the Baptismal Regeneration of infants.

Augustine taught clearly and with utmost confidence (see § 357) that baptized infants dying in infancy are saved, and that infants dying unbaptized are lost. Such teaching, few will now maintain. That it was once generally and confidently believed, warns us that general consent is no sure test of truth.

In the Catechism given in the Anglican Prayer Book, the candidate for confirmation is taught that in baptism, which in nearly every case is administered in infancy, he "was made a member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven." This implies that in the rite of baptism infants enter into a relation to Christ, to God, and to the Kingdom of Heaven, which was not theirs before the rite was administered.

The second term, *child of God*, and its equivalent, *son of God*, are frequent in N.T., almost always in one definite sense and always in senses closely allied. And, in the absence of any indication to the contrary, it must be so understood in the Catechism. From Rom. $8^{14\text{-}17}$, Gal. 3^{26f}, 4^{6f}; Mt. $5^{9,\ 45}$; 1 Jno. 3^{10}, we learn that it denotes an acquired sonship, implying inward spiritual life: see § 242ff. Even in Lk. 15^{24} (cp. Acts 17^{28}) we cannot conceive a sonship derived from any such rite as infant baptism. Notice above that the sons

are "also heirs." The phrase "*member of Christ*" recalls Paul's metaphor of the body of Christ: see § 372. Now, as we saw in § 370, Paul always assumes that church-members are believing and justified children of God: and this is implied in the collocation of these three terms in the Anglican Catechism. In other words, it teaches that in baptism infants are placed in living union with Christ, are received into the number of God's adopted children, and obtain a right to a share in the heritage of the brethren of Christ.

445. This teaching involves issues FAR MORE SERIOUS than at first sight appears. If blessings are wrought by the Holy Spirit, in the heart of an unconscious infant, in baptism, this must be so by whomsoever the rite is administered, even though in an utterly frivolous spirit or by a bad man: for if its validity depends on the devoutness or character of the man baptizing, the infant baptized cannot in future use with any confidence the language put into his lips by the Catechism. It follows then, from the teaching before us, that the waving of the dripping hand of a thoughtless or bad man works invariably, if a certain ritual be followed, in an unconscious infant, an actual spiritual change, and places him in a new relation to Christ, to God, and to the Kingdom of Heaven. Such salvation by legerdemain is utterly unlike anything in the Bible.

446. This doctrine would BREAK all ANALOGY between baptism and the Lord's Supper: for in 1 Cor. $11^{27\text{-}29}$ Paul teaches that the effect of the Supper depends on the mental attitude of him who "eats and drinks." We have no hint that circumcision brought immediate inward and spiritual benefit even to Isaac. The O.T. sacrifices were sometimes offered, under God's appointment, by bad priests: but we are never taught that they conveyed direct spiritual blessing apart from the intelligent faith of those who interpreted the

meaning of these sacred symbols. Spiritual blessing to an unconscious infant by an external rite is alien to the whole tenor of the Bible.

Moreover, if the hands of the man who baptizes convey, by their simple movement, spiritual blessing so great, we naturally ask, Whose are the hands to which this MYSTERIOUS POWER is given? It is true that even the Roman Church admits as valid, in cases of necessity, lay baptism. But this is evidently exceptional. The power to distribute spiritual gifts cannot be universal; but must be derived from competent authority. At once come in questions of ecclesiastical pedigree: and these raise questions about the right of the Anglican Church to rebel, under compulsion of Henry and Elizabeth, against an ecclesiastical authority which it had long recognised, and which traces its descent from apostles of Christ. No wonder that many, claiming this mysterious prerogative, have felt bound in consistency themselves to submit to the Roman obedience. Paul taught (Gal. 5^3) that Gentiles accepting the rite of circumcision were thereby binding themselves to keep the whole Mosaic Law. They who teach that any spiritual blessing, be it an inward work of the Holy Spirit or a changed relation to God, follows invariably the baptism of an unconscious infant, are unwittingly riveting the fetters of spiritual bondage.

447. Certainly, for teaching so unlike all else in the Bible and involving results so serious, we may fairly claim CLEAR and abundant PROOF. What is the proof adduced? Simply N.T. teaching about the baptism of believers: for no other baptism is ever mentioned there. In order to prove that spiritual blessings are conveyed in baptism to an unconscious infant, we are reminded that in the N.T. similar blessings are said to be obtained by faith, that Christ required this faith to be confessed in the rite of baptism, and that con-

sequently in a few places baptism is spoken of as a condition or means of salvation. See § 426, where all the relevant N.T. passages are quoted; and all refer evidently to believers. Surely never was a great and unstable and dangerous structure erected on so untrustworthy a foundation.

448. WHOSE CHILDREN ought we to baptize? If baptism made them full members of the Church, we should hesitate to baptize children of parents not themselves church-members. Such hesitation is needless. That an infant is brought for baptism, proves him to be under Christian influences, and under the privileges and responsibilities of the New Covenant. We therefore erect over him the sign of the covenant. By bringing him, the parents recognise their obligation to train him for Christ. Let us take them at their word, and press upon them the greatness of their responsibility. But we have no right to claim that the baptized be brought up in our own communion: for baptism is a rite, not of one denomination, but of the universal Church. By bringing him to us, the parents claim for him our pastoral care. This we are bound to give: and usually the best way of doing so known to us is to gather him into our own section of the Church. But our aim is to lead him to Christ.

449. TO SUM UP. Baptism is a divinely-erected monument of the New Covenant, and specifically of the truth that in Christ God requires, and waits to impart, a purity otherwise unattainable. In the case of Jews and heathens, the monument can be erected only on those who personally accept the Covenant: and it is to them a mode of confession; and, as commanded by Christ, a condition, in ordinary circumstances, of salvation.

On the other hand, parental influence places the children

of Christians in very definite relation to the New Covenant: for, from their parents, they will hear the Gospel, and by it will be judged. This is to them an infinite privilege, and to children and parents involves solemn responsibility. Of this relation and privilege and responsibility, the baptism of infants is a formal recognition. Its benefit is in the truths therein embodied: for these are a channel through which the Holy Spirit imparts spiritual life. The actual gain is in proportion to the truth apprehended by the persons present. But we have no hint that the rite alters in any way the infant's relation to God or to the Covenant, or works in him any immediate spiritual change: for the blessings connected in the N.T. with baptism of believers cannot be predicated of infants, who are incapable of faith, the unique condition of all the blessings of the New Covenant. We have seen that infants cannot be reckoned as members of the Church in the same full sense as are those who have entered it by personal confession; but that children under Christian influences form an outer court designed to be a pathway to the inner sanctuary of personal confession, and claiming in equal measure the Christian pastor's care. In other words, by their birth under Christian influences, the children of Christian parents are placed on the threshold of the Church, in a position which compels them either to cross the threshold or to turn their back upon it. Of this solemn position, the baptism of infants is a formal recognition.

450. THE MODE OF BAPTISM. The word *βαπτίζω*, transliterated *baptize*, is derived from *βάπτω*, to *dip*, as in Lk. 16^{24}, Jno. 13^{26}, Ruth (LXX.) 2^{14}; or to *soak* or *stain*, as in Dan. (Theod.) 4^{30}, 5^{21}, Rev. 19^{13}. The word *baptize* is found in 2 Kgs. 5^{14}, "he *baptized* himself in Jordan seven times;" Judith 12^{7}, "*baptized* herself over the spring of water;"

and metaphorically in Isa. 21^4, "lawlessness *overwhelms* me." In Sirach 31^{30} the purification prescribed in Num. 19^{19} is described as "being *baptized* from a corpse." In Mk. 7^4 we read of some who, when they come from market, "unless they *baptize* themselves, do not eat;" where the two best mss. read *sprinkle*, but give *baptize* in Lk. 11^{38}, as do all mss. and versions. Also, in Mk. 7^4, we find "*baptisms* of cups and pots and brazen vessels," some early mss. and versions adding, "and beds." The baptisms were probably the sprinklings mentioned in Num. 19^{18}.

The same word *baptize* became the common technical term for the rite performed by John, and for the initiatory rite ordained by Christ: Mt. 3^6, 28^{19}. Its metaphorical use in Mt. 3^{11}, Acts 1^5, Mk. 10^{38f}, Lk. 12^{50}, 1 Cor. 10^2, reveals its firm hold on the thought of Israel. In classical, and more frequently in later, Greek, the word is occasionally used in the sense of *dip*, or *sink*, or *soak*: *e.g.* in Plato's *Symposium* p. 176^b, drunken men are spoken of as *baptized*.

451. From the above use of the word, some have argued that the only ordinary way of rightly obeying Christ's command to *baptize* is by complete IMMERSION in water. But we have in the N.T. no indication that any one mode of baptism is essential: and, to make the mode of a rite essential, is utterly alien to the Gospel. In the Lord's Supper, the relation between the visible symbols and the truths symbolized does not consist in minute similarity of detail but in spiritual significance. Indeed, we do not hesitate to go so far as to hold sometimes the Supper in the *morning*, when this is the time most convenient to the worshippers. That the passage of the Red Sea by the Israelites dryshod is described in 1 Cor. 10^2 as their being "baptized for Moses," proves that in Paul's thought immersion was no part of the idea of

baptism: in this case, the immersion was reserved for the Egyptians. This is also implied in the metaphor of baptism "in the Holy Spirit," Mt. 3^{11}, Acts 1^{5}, afterwards described in *v.*^{8} as "the Holy Spirit coming upon you:" cp. ch. 8^{16}. In the Levitical purifications, sprinkling had a large place: *e.g.* Num. 19^{18}; cp. Ezek. 36^{25}. Certainly sprinkling was one method of ceremonial cleansing.

452. That in the early Church immersion was NOT ESSENTIAL to a valid baptism, is implied in the reference to it in *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* ch. 7: "In this way baptize.... If thou have not fresh water, baptize *into* other water: if thou canst not do it in cold, use warm. If thou have neither, pour out *into* the head water three times *into* the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit." The use here of the preposition εἰς, which cannot have a uniform rendering into English, warns us not hastily to infer from it that baptism must be by immersion. This quotation suggests perhaps that immersion was a usual form of baptism; but asserts that, when inconvenient, pouring was allowed. In our climate, immersion is inconvenient, in some cases impracticable, and in most cases open to serious objection. In the absence of any specific direction as to the mode of baptism, this is a sufficient reason for sprinkling. A few drops of water, like a morsel of bread and a little wine, are sufficient to set before us the symbol ordained by Christ. The truth symbolized would not be more effectively set forth, if a larger quantity of water were used. But without these drops of water, and the bread and wine, the services would be essentially incomplete.

An argument for immersion has been sought in the metaphor "buried with Christ" in Rom. 6^{4}, Col. 2^{11}. But in ancient Greece, the sprinkling of a handful of dust was a valid burial: so Sophocles, *Antig.* ll. 385, 402, 404, 429ff.

453. No definite *term* is found in the N.T. embracing Baptism and the Lord's Supper; nor are these conspicuously placed together: but see 1 Cor. 10^{2-4}. Yet, as rites expressly ordained by Christ for all His servants and embodying conspicuous doctrines of the Gospel, they may be suitably classed together as the Two SACRAMENTS of the Christian Church.

The word SACRAMENTUM is, in the Latin Vulgate version, the rendering of *μυστήριον* in Eph. 1^{9}, $3^{3.\ 9}$, 5^{32}, Col. 1^{27}, 1 Tim. 3^{16}, Rev. 1^{20}, 17^{7}; which elsewhere, *e.g.* Mt. 13^{11}, Rom. 11^{25}, 16^{25}, Eph. 3^{4}, 6^{19}, Rev. 10^{7}, 17^{5}, is transliterated MYSTERIUM. It was the common word for the military oath taken by all Roman soldiers.

The same name *sacrament* is given by the Roman Church to *confirmation*, *penance* or *penitence*, *extreme unction*, *holy order*, and *matrimony*: *Council of Trent* session 7, canon 1. But not all seven are of equal value: can. 3. Of these extra five, *confirmation* is not expressly commanded by Christ apart from baptism. On the other hand, in Acts 8^{17} we find men who had been baptized through the preaching of Philip but had not yet received the Holy Spirit, on whom apostles "laid their hands and they received the Spirit:" cp. Heb. 6^{2}, "baptisms and laying on of hands." About this rite, however, we have no definite N.T. teaching. The word *pœnitentia* rendered above *penance* is the constant Latin rendering of the Greek word rendered (A.V. and R.V.) *repentance*, denoting always, not a sacred rite, but a change of mind. In the Roman Church the "sacrament of penance" includes confession to, and absolution by, a priest: *Counc. of Trent*, sess. xiv. can. 5 and 6. But about these, as an abiding institution in the Church, the N.T. is silent. Nor do we find anything about *extreme unction*, *i.e.* an anointing of the dying. Holy *Order* and *matrimony* are not obligatory on all church-members. It is therefore undesirable to call these five rites *sacraments*,

as in *Counc. of Trent*, sess. vii. can. 1; thus placing them in the same category with the two mutually-related rites expressly ordained by Christ.

CHAPTER LII

THE LORD'S DAY AND THE JEWISH SABBATH

454. CLOSELY related to Baptism and the Lord's Supper as an important institution of the Church and as a symbolic presentment of truth taught by Christ, yet, as not expressly ordained by Him, not to be placed in line with them as a third sacrament, is the LORD'S DAY. Moreover, just as the above rites have in the earlier covenant counterparts in circumcision and the passover, so has the Lord's Day in the JEWISH SABBATH, without which it cannot be understood.

455. The word *sabbath* is an English form of a Hebrew word denoting always a SACRED REST. The corresponding verb denotes sometimes simply to *cease* as in Gen. 8^{22}, "while the earth remains, seedtime and harvest . . . shall not *cease*," Josh. 5^{12}, Jer. 31^{36}, Pr. 22^{10}, Job 32^{1}, Neh. 6^{3}; and sometimes to *keep* a sacred *rest*, *e.g.* Gen. 2^{2}, "and He *kept-sabbath* on the seventh day from all His work which He made: and God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it; because in it He *kept-sabbath* from all His work which God created and made;" Ex. 16^{30}, 23^{12}, 34^{21}.

In Lev. $23^{7.\ 8.\ 25.\ 35.\ 36.\ 39}$ we find, in addition to the weekly rest, certain days of certain months in which "all *servile* work" was forbidden; and these seem to be called *sabbaths*, once (*v.*^{24}) in the lengthened form *sabbathôn*. But the

weekly rest and the Day of Atonement are raised above all other days as (Ex. 20^{10}, 31^{15}, Dt. 5^{14}) a rest from "all work" of every kind; and by a special superlative title, which we may render *sabbath of sabbath-keeping*: Lev. $23^{3, 32}$. Notice especially Lev. 25^{2-8}, "when ye shall enter into the land which I am giving to thee, then shall the land *keep-sabbath*, a *sabbath* for Jehovah. Six years thou shalt sow thy field, and six years thou shalt prune thy vineyard and thou shalt gather in its produce. And in the seventh year there shall be a *sabbath of sabbath-keeping* for the land, a *sabbath* for Jehovah: thy field thou shalt not sow, and thy vineyard thou shalt not prune. That which grows of itself of thy harvest thou shalt not harvest, and the grapes of thy undressed vine thou shalt not gather, a *sabbath of sabbath-keeping* it shall be for the land. And the *sabbath* of the land shall be for you for food, for thee and for thy servant and for thy maid and for thy hireling and for thy stranger that sojourns with thee. . . . And thou shalt number seven *sabbaths* of years." Also ch. 26^{34}: "then shall the land enjoy her *sabbaths*, all the days of her desolation while ye are in the land of your enemies; then shall the land *keep-sabbath* and shall enjoy her *sabbaths*." These quotations refer to the sabbatic year: but, when not otherwise defined, the word *sabbath* is a sufficient and frequent designation of the weekly rest: and the use of the word gives to the seventh day a unique place of honour among the many sacred days prescribed in the Law.

456. Among other ordinances, the weekly sabbath is conspicuous as the SIGN of the Mosaic Covenant: so Ex. 31^{13-17}, "to keep the *sabbath* throughout their generations for an eternal covenant. It is a *sign* between Me and the sons of Israel for ever:" cp. Ezek. 20^{12}. It thus takes in some sense the place of circumcision (Gen. 17^{10-14}) in the Covenant

with Abraham. The frequent and regular recurrence of the weekly rest made it a very appropriate test, and visible expression, of loyalty to the covenant with God. It is still further raised above all other ritual prescriptions by its place in the DECALOGUE among commandments valid every one for all time and all men; and by being based there and in Gen. 2^3, Ex. 31^{17} upon God's work in CREATION. Careful study will reveal more and more the unique place of the weekly rest in the Old Covenant. Its moral significance may be read in Isa. 56^{1-6}, 58^{13}, Jer. 17^{21-27}, Ezek. 20^{12-24}, Neh. 10^{31}, 13^{15-22}; and its worth in the eyes of the more pious of the later Jews, in 1 Macc. 1^{39}, 2^{34-41}.

457. That the weekly rest was EARLIER THAN MOSES, is not proved by Gen. 2^3: for even after a lapse of time an institution may have been ordained to commemorate a bygone event. Nor is it disproved by Ezek. 20^{10-12}: for an already existing institution might at the Exodus have been made by God a "sign" of the new covenant then given to Israel. That the princes of Israel in the wilderness (Ex. 16^{22}) did not understand the double supply of manna, suggests perhaps that the sabbath was not then known to them. On the other hand, Gen. $8^{10.\ 12}$ suggests that a period of seven days was already used as a division of time: and, although this does not imply a weekly day of sacred rest, the division of time into weeks is much more easy to understand if the weeks were separated by a sacred day. The word *remember* in Ex. 20^8, if it is anything more than an emphatic form of the parallel phrase "keep the sabbath day" in Dt. 5^{12}, refers doubtless to the mention of the sabbath in Ex. 16^{29f}. It is no proof that the sabbath was earlier than the departure from Egypt. Indeed, taken together, the above casual and uncertain notes have little weight as evidence either that the sabbath was not, or was,

earlier than the Exodus. But the double supply of manna on the 6th day with no manna on the 7th, and the mention of the sabbath in Ex. $16^{25\text{-}30}$ before the giving of the Decalogue, are additional marks of honour to the weekly day of rest.

458. The week itself was UNKNOWN to the early Greeks and Romans; and apparently to THE GENTILES generally. Dion Cassius, (*Roman History* bk. $37^{16\text{-}18}$,) after saying that the Jews consecrated Saturday, states that in his day (about A.D. 230) the division of time into weeks was universal, though not of early date among the Greeks and Romans, and that they received it from the Egyptians. But we have not, so far as I know, any reliable traces of a weekly day of rest among the Egyptians. On the other hand, that something like it was known to the Babylonians and ASSYRIANS, is proved by a Babylonian calendar for a sacred month, in the Assyrian language, which, amid sacrifices for other days, describes the 7th, 14th, 19th, 21st, and 28th days as "days unlawful to work on," and forbids the king to eat his ordinary food or change his dress or do his ordinary royal duties on them. Since these were days of a lunar month, which contains $29\frac{1}{2}$ days, they would not coincide with the Jewish sabbath, which is each seventh day all the year round, independently of the moon. But the similarity is worthy of notice. An Assyrian form of the word *sabbath* has been found; and is explained as "day of rest of heart;" but it is not used in the calendar mentioned above. Other Babylonian inscriptions reveal the sacredness of the number *seven*.

A sevenfold division of time is mentioned in the INDIAN VEDAS. So Rig-veda 1^{50}, in a hymn to the sun-god: "clear-sighted god of day, thy seven ruddy mares bear on thy rushing car. With these thy self-yoked steeds, seven daughters of thy chariot, onward thou dost advance." Also Atharva-veda 19^{53}, in a hymn to time: "time, like a bril-

liant steed with seven rays . . . time, like a seven-wheeled, seven-naved car, moves on." But I learn from a reliable authority that these are the only references to a seven-fold division of time in Indian literature earlier than our era; and that there is no reference there to a weekly rest. But in later days the week became prevalent in India.

Similar scanty references are found in the literature of China.

459. The EARLY CHRISTIAN WRITERS assume that the Sabbath did not exist before Moses. So Justin (*Dialogue with Trypho* ch. 19) says in argument with a Jew, referring to Adam, Abel, Enoch, and Melchizedek: "all these were just men and righteous in the sight of God without even keeping the sabbath." And Irenæus (*Against Heresies* bk. iv. 16^2) writes: "without circumcision and without observance of the sabbath, Abraham believed God and it was reckoned to him for righteousness." Probably these quotations represent the opinion of the Apostolic Church. But the distance of time and the absence of independent sources of information deprive this opinion of any critical value as evidence of the date of the first institution of the weekly rest.

The above casual references leave us unable to determine with confidence whether the Sabbath was earlier than the Mosaic Covenant. The matter is unimportant. For, that it rested on a basis broader than that Covenant, is proved by its connection with God's work at the Creation.

460. CHRIST HONOURED the Sabbath by joining on that day in the synagogue worship: Mk. 1^{21}, 3^2, 6^2, Lk. $4^{16, 31}$, 13^{10}. On the sabbath, several miracles were wrought: Lk. $14^{1, 4}$, Jno. 5^9, 7^{23}, 9^{14}. Very important is the discourse recorded in Mt. 12^{1-8}, Mk. 2^{23-28}, Lk. 6^{1-5}. All three accounts say that the Pharisees found fault with the disciples for not observing

the sabbath with sufficient strictness, and that Christ defended them by appealing to the case of David, who in great need took bread which the Law reserved for priests only: and all represent Christ as adding, "the Son of Man is Lord of the Sabbath," leaving His hearers to infer that His presence superseded all sabbath restrictions. In Mt. 12^5, the example of David is supported by the strong words, "the priests in the temple *profane the sabbath*, and are blameless;" implying that no service for God is profanation of the sabbath: and Christ goes on to quote Hos. 6^6, "I desire mercy, not sacrifice."

In Mk. 2^{27}, and here only, Christ says, in support of His main contention, "the SABBATH was made FOR THE MAN, not the man for the sabbath;" evidently meaning that the sabbath is not an end but a means, that it is subordinate to the interests of those to whom it was given. From these words, some have inferred that the Sabbath was designed for the whole race. But the term *the man* (ὁ ἄνθρωπος) does not suggest, as does the English rendering *man*, the whole race, but only any individual (cp. "the sower," Mt. 13^3) who is keeping or profaning the day. Moreover, we have in the whole passage no hint that Christ wished to pay honour to the day, but only to show its subordinate position. To build a general argument on this solitary passage, spoken with another aim in view, is unworthy of theology.

We notice also that Christ, who in Lk. 6^7, $13^{10\text{-}16}$, $14^{1\text{-}5}$, Jno. $5^{9\text{-}18}$, 7^{22f}, rebukes men who interpreted too strictly the law of the sabbath, says nothing, except by doubtful inference from Mk. 2^{27}, in support of the due observance of the day.

461. The only OTHER REFERENCES, in the N.T., to the sabbath are in the same direction. Among other command-

ments quoted, we never find the fourth. In Rom. 14^5, while discussing distinction of food, Paul treats the distinction of days as unimportant. In Gal. 4^{10}, his readers' observance of "days and months and seasons and years" prompts fear that he has laboured for them in vain. In Col. 2^{16}, he bids them let no one judge them "in eating or in drinking or in matter of a feast or new moon or sabbath." This last word suggests that the "days" in Gal. 4^{10} included the sabbath. All this implies that, like the distinction of food (Mk. $7^{15,18}$, Acts 10^{15}), so marked a feature of the Mosaic Covenant, also the command to keep sacred the seventh day was in some sense ANNULLED by Christ, and that the great principle of Rom. 6^{14}, 1 Cor. 9^{20}, that we are "not under law but under grace," includes the sabbath law.

462. In marked contrast to this comparative disregard of the day so highly honoured in the O.T., we find in the N.T. special honour paid to ANOTHER DAY. On the "day after the sabbath" (Mt. 28^1) Christ rose from the dead; and on the evening of the same day (Jno. 20^{19}) appeared to the assembled disciples. A week later (*v.*^{26}) He appeared to them again, and by showing His wounded hands evoked from Thomas the first clear recognition of His absolute divinity. Seven weeks and a day, or fifty days, after the feast of the firstfruits (Lv. 23^{15f}), *i.e.* after the high sabbath during which Christ lay dead in the grave, and therefore on a Sunday, Christ founded His Church by pouring upon the assembled disciples the Holy Spirit. The infinite importance of these stupendous events gives to the first day of the week a glory never conferred on the seventh. On the same day, we find (Acts 20^7) a Christian meeting held: and in 1 Cor. 16^2 Paul prescribes it as the day for laying by money for a charitable purpose. In Rev. 1^{10}, we read of *the Lord's Day*, which is honoured by a special revelation to John. The distinction

already given to the "day after the sabbath" leaves no room for doubt that this was the Lord's Day.

463. All this is confirmed by EARLY CHRISTIAN WRITERS. In the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* ch. 14, early in the 2nd cent., we read: "each Lord's Day (κατὰ κυριακὴν Κυρίου) come together and break bread and give thanks," or "celebrate the Eucharist." So Ep. of Barnabas ch. 15, probably a few years later, after a long reference to the sabbath which the writer takes as a prophecy of a long rest at the end of the world: "for which cause also we keep the eighth day for gladness, in which Jesus rose from the dead." Justin writes (middle of 2nd cent.) *First Apology* ch. 67, "on what is called Sunday there is a coming together to one place of all who dwell in town or country, and the memoirs of the apostles and the writings of the prophets are read;" and says that this is followed by exhortation and the Lord's Supper, adding, "on Sunday we all make our common gathering, since it is the first day in which God changed darkness and crude matter and made the world; and Jesus Christ our Saviour on the same day rose from the dead." A succession of later writers removes all doubt that the first day of the week was called the Lord's Day, and was made a special day of worship in the early Church.

CHAPTER LIII

THE LORD'S DAY: ITS PERMANENT VALIDITY

464. WE saw in § 455f unique honour paid in the O.T. to one day of the week; and that, by its relation to the work of creation and its place in the Decalogue, the Jewish

sabbath was placed on a basis broader than the Mosaic Law. We have now found in the N.T. and in the early Church still more conspicuous honour paid to one day of the week; but not to the same day. The CHANGE OF DAY marks a transition from the Old Covenant to the New: and the honour paid in each covenant to one day in seven suggests that a COMMON ELEMENT underlies both, and that the Lord's Day bears to the Jewish Sabbath a relation similar to that of the New Covenant to the Old. That this is actually the case, the following considerations will prove.

465. The experience of multitudes in all ages and Churches has found in the weekly day of rest INCALCULABLE and many-sided BENEFIT. The gain to the body by regular intervals of rest from the monotonous toil of daily life can never be estimated; nor can the opportunity thus afforded for mental culture. Still more valuable is the leisure thus obtained, amid the imperious demands of the present life, for contemplation of the eternal realities of the life to come. Moreover, observance of this sacred rest in spite of these pressing cares is an acknowledgment, in view of many who through forgetfulness of God are slaves to the world around, of the greater importance of things unseen. Thus, like the Lord's Supper, the Lord's Day gives visible form to the service of God. Moreover, the observance by all Christians of the same day of rest renders united worship possible; and makes the outward aspect of society a recognition of God. For these reasons—and they might be multiplied indefinitely, and have much more force than appears on the surface—were there no divine obligation, it would be expedient for our highest interests to keep a frequent and regularly-recurring day of rest, and that all Christians should keep the same day.

This reveals the gain actually derived from the prevalent

BELIEF, whatever be its grounds, that the day of rest was ORDAINED BY GOD. Indeed, it is not easy to see how otherwise all Christians would agree to keep the same day: and, without agreement, the day would have no binding moral authority. Consequently, either this belief is correct or an error has been to the world a manifold and incalculable benefit. This benefit is an element of good in the Jewish sabbath suitable to all nations and all ages.

466. In §§ 64, 83, we found in the O.T. decisive proof that ancient ISRAEL ANTICIPATED the Gospel of Christ and modern religious life in its clear conception of, and faith in, one personal God, the Creator of heaven and earth, the righteous Ruler of the world, and the loving Friend and Saviour of men: and in this knowledge of God, unique in ancient literature, we found decisive proof of a revelation given by God to Israel and not given to other nations. We have now seen that Israel anticipated Christianity in keeping ONE DAY A WEEK as a sacred rest. This confirms the evidence, just referred to, of a special revelation to Israel. Certainly, the teacher who gave to his nation an institution so rich in blessing for all mankind was indeed taught by God.

We have now before us TWO well-attested historical FACTS, and an EXPERIENCE as wide as Christianity. (1) We have in the O.T. decisive documentary evidence that God bade ancient Israel to keep the seventh day of the week as a sacred rest; and (2) in the N.T. decisive proof, confirmed by all later Christian literature, that Christ paid silent but conspicuous and unique honour to the day after the Jewish Sabbath.

This honour, His followers interpreted and imitated by calling the day thus honoured the *Lord's Day* and by keeping it as a sacred rest, thus passing by the day consecrated by God for Israel. By thus keeping up the weekly

rest, they have (3) reaped benefits so vast, so far-reaching, and so far beyond human forethought, as to leave no room for doubt that in thus using the Lord's Day they are working out a purpose of God and receiving benefits designed for them by God. The unspeakable greatness of the benefits reveals their DIVINE SOURCE. From all this we infer with complete confidence that when God gave to Israel the weekly day of rest, He DESIGNED it FOR ALL AGES and nations; and that, when He bade Israel to sanctify the seventh day, He did so with a definite purpose that that day should in due time be SUPERSEDED by still greater honour to ANOTHER DAY.

467. Notice here an argument resting on a THREEFOLD BASIS, (1) the divine institution of the Jewish Sabbath, (2) the honour paid by Christ to the day after the sabbath, and (3) the great and manifold benefit of the weekly rest. No one of these is of itself sufficient: but their united force is irresistible. The first, by itself, would lie open to objections from the transitory nature of the Old Covenant: the second needs the first and third, to interpret its significance: the third is, taken alone, merely an argument from expediency, and might be set aside by a counter expediency. The benefit of the weekly rest suggests strongly its divine origin; and this suggestion is raised to certainty by the divine institution of the Jewish Sabbath and the honour paid by Christ to the day following. Similarly, the necessity of the moral law for the existence, growth, and well-being of society suggests or proves its divine origin. This TRIPLE ARGUMENT moreover is not weakened by the change of day, as would be any argument based only on the Mosaic Law.

If the above inferences be just, by keeping the Lord's Day we are doing the will of God and are receiving benefits designed by Him for us. To neglect it, would be to trample

underfoot a PRECIOUS and divine GIFT. We therefore keep it, not as a condition or means of the favour of God or under fear of penalty, but with gratitude for so great a gift and desirous to obtain all the blessings it is designed to convey; and this desire will guide our mode of spending the sacred day.

468. Hitherto we have left out of sight the SYMBOLIC significance of the sabbath in common with the whole Mosaic ritual. This is embodied in the words *holy* and *sanctify* everywhere given to every part of that ritual: see ch. 32. God claimed for Himself from Israel one tribe out of twelve, one day in seven, and one-tenth of all produce, in order to assert His universal ownership. He now claims in Christ that every man be His servant and priest, that all our possessions be consecrated to Him, and every day and hour be spent for Him. To us, therefore, in the highest sense conceivable every day is "holy for the Lord." But this by no means lessens the benefit of separating, from the secular toil which forms so large a part of the work God has allotted to most of us, a portion of time for meditation and evangelical work. For this separation greatly helps us to spend our whole time for God.

469. We understand now the Jewish sabbath in its relation to the Gospel of Christ. Whether earlier than the Law, or not, it was commanded in the Law; and was made a sign, and conspicuous feature, of the Old Covenant. It was therefore binding on every Israelite under pain of God's displeasure: and they who sought salvation by law sought it in part by strict observance of the sabbath. This is the LEGAL aspect. Again, like the entire Mosaic ritual, the sabbath was a SYMBOL of the Christian life. In these two aspects, the legal and symbolic, the Jewish sabbath has passed away: or rather has ATTAINED its GOAL in the fuller revelation in Christ. Instead of one day sanctified for Jehovah,

every day is now spent for Christ. The Law has led us to Christ: and the Voice which once condemned us for past disobedience, and made the favour of God impossible by reason of our powerlessness to obey in the future, has been silenced by the Voice from the Cross. In these two senses, the Law, even the law of the sabbath, is to us as completely a thing of the past as is the schooling of our childhood.

470. But underneath the legal and symbolic aspects of the sabbath, which pertain only to the Old Covenant, lay an element of UNIVERSAL and ABIDING VALUE, viz. the manifold benefit of the weekly rest. To secure this benefit for Israel, and through Israel for the world, God embodied the sabbath in the O.T. law and ritual: and when the Old Covenant was superseded by the New, Christ secured for His Church the same advantages by paying special honour to another day. But, like everything in the Gospel, the Lord's Day is not so much a LAW as a FREE GIFT from God. While keeping it, we think, not of the penalty of disobedience, but of the great benefits received thereby in the kind providence of God: and we spend the day, not according to a written prescription, but in such way as seems to us most conducive to the good of ourselves and others. Thus is the Lord's Day a Christian counterpart of the Jewish sabbath; and differs from it only as the Gospel differs from the Law.

Similarly, as a visible embodiment of the truth that our salvation comes through the shed blood of the innocent, the Jewish sacrifices have in some sense a Christian counterpart in the Lord's Supper. And the rite of infant baptism, which is not expressly enjoined in the N.T., reproduces in the Christian Church, by recognising the relation of the little ones to the God of their fathers, a part of the spiritual significance of infant circumcision.

471. The above EXPLAINS both the TEACHING and the SILENCE of O.T. and N.T. about the Jewish sabbath and the Lord's Day. The wider purpose of Israel's day of rest is the easiest explanation of its place in the Decalogue and of its reference there to the creation of the world. Probably the great benefit it was designed to confer on Israel and on the world moved God to select the sabbath, whether previously existing or not, to be the special sign of the Mosaic Covenant: for, by thus selecting it, He gave it a sure place in the national life. The absence in the N.T. of any exhortation to keep the sabbath, like that in Isa. $56^{2\text{-}6}$, and Paul's unfavourable references to it in Rom. 14^{5}, Gal. 4^{10}, Col. 2^{16}, were prompted probably by the passing away in Christ of the Mosaic Covenant, and of its sign. So was probably the absence in the N.T. of any teaching about the relation of the Lord's Day to the Jewish sabbath and to the fourth commandment. Any such teaching, suggesting a mere transference from one day to another, would have seriously blunted, by inevitable misinterpretation, Paul's resistance to the advocates of the Mosaic Law as still binding on Christians. Abundant indications of the close relation between these two sacred days were stored, for those who have eyes to see, in the Sacred Records. The inference was left to be observed, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, as was the baptism of infants, in the later ages of the Church. In the meantime, by Christ and the apostolic Church a unique honour was paid to the "day after the sabbath" which marked it out unmistakably as the Day of Days.

We now see the reason for the CHANGE OF DAY. The disregard of the Jewish sabbath in Rom. 14^{5}, Gal. 4^{10}, Col. 2^{16}, like that of the distinction of food in Mk. $7^{15\text{-}19}$, was a conspicuous assertion that the ancient law was no longer binding. At the same time, by paying to another

day greater honour than was ever paid to the Jewish sabbath, Christ silently but effectively reserved intact for His Church the PERMANENT ELEMENT of blessing which underlay the day consecrated at Sinai. We now possess it to the full, with the highest sanction, in the day which commemorates the resurrection of Christ and the founding of His Church.

472. In exact accord with the above exposition, is the usage of EARLY CHRISTIAN WRITERS. The first day of the week is constantly called the Lord's Day, and is spoken of as specially honoured and as the day of Christian worship. But, so far as I know, not until the Council of Macon in A.D. 585 have we any hint of a transfer of the sacred rest from the seventh to the first day, or of obligation to keep the Lord's Day on the ground of the fourth (or third) commandment. Very interesting is Augustine's note on Ps. 91^1, where he contrasts the Jews' sabbath, which he says they waste in bodily idleness, with the Christians' inward rest, which he calls the sabbath of the heart. The whole note goes far to prove that Augustine did not look upon the Lord's Day as a Christian counterpart of the Jewish sabbath. Equally interesting is a treatise of doubtful authorship and date on *The Sabbath and Circumcision* attributed to Athanasius, in which, although the Lord's Day is not called a sabbath or placed in any relation to the fourth commandment, it is nevertheless shown to stand in close relationship to the Jewish sabbath. See also the much earlier quotation in § 463 from the Ep. of Barnabas.

The first Christian emperor, CONSTANTINE, decreed in A.D. 321, that all judges and people residing in cities rest from work on Sunday, permitting only agriculture. He thus recognised publicly the day of rest as a Christian institution.

But neither imperial decrees nor command of the ancient Law nor tradition of the early Church are needed by those

who have experienced the great and various benefit of the rest and leisure of the Lord's Day. The greatness of the benefit is to them abundant proof of the divine origin and authority of the Christian day of rest.

473. REVIEW OF PART X. We notice at once the scantiness of the evidence adduced above for the Church and its ordinances as compared with the abundant and varied and decisive evidence adduced in PARTS IV.-VIII. for the great doctrines of the Gospel, *e.g.* the pardon of sins through faith and through the death of Christ, the resurrection and divinity of Christ, and a new life of devotion to Christ inbreathed by the Holy Spirit into those who put faith in Him, evidence appealing to our best intelligence and confirmed by an inward experience of this new life in Christ. Such abundant and decisive documentary evidence, and such direct verification in our own experience, cannot be brought, in the same measure, especially for details, for the doctrines and institutions just discussed.

474. Yet certain main points stand out as resting on a secure foundation. That the Founder of Christianity founded a community called the Church, which He placed in abiding relation to Himself as the outward and visible organ for His further manifestation of Himself to men and for the building up of His Kingdom, is placed beyond doubt by adequate documentary evidence; and is confirmed by the wonderful story of the Church in later ages which tells how, in spite of human error and sin and shame, even through ages of darkness, this company of His followers lived on, emerging again and again from deep degradation, till it is to-day purer and stronger than ever; and is still further confirmed by the infinite spiritual benefit received in all ages from the

brotherhood, and the various ministrations, of the Church. The History of the Church lies beyond the scope of this volume: but this delightful study illustrates and confirms the doctrines here expounded, is needful for a correct appreciation of many modern controversies, and is wonderfully helpful for a development of the spiritual life.

On similar and sufficient evidence rest Baptism and the Lord's Supper, as expressly commanded by Christ; and the Lord's Day as designed by Him for all His servants in all ages.

475. Up to this point, there is practical UNANIMITY among the followers of Christ. The matters which separate the Churches rest upon very slight documentary evidence, are incapable of verification in our own experience, and are in no small measure contradicted by the facts of modern Christian life. For the more part they consist of efforts to limit the blessings of the New Covenant to one's own communion or to certain forms peculiar to it. So long as we stand on the clear and abundant teaching of the N.T., we stand together; and our reading of it is confirmed by our experience of the Christian life within and around us. Antagonisms arise only when we attempt to build a little house for ourselves alone on the uncertain foundation of a few doubtful passages in the Bible or upon logical arguments of which the premises are accepted without proof. Our loyalty to Christ binds us to sift with extreme care any argument which hinders harmonious co-operation, in all good works, with all other servants of Christ.

PART XI

THE LAST THINGS

CHAPTER LIV

RETRIBUTION BEYOND THE GRAVE, CONTINUED FROM CHAPTER III

476. In chs. 1-3 we found in Nature clear indications of an unseen and intelligent Creator of the world, the righteous Ruler of men; and in the social life of men around, viewed in the light of the inborn moral sense of man, we saw plain intimations of retribution beyond the grave. In the immense superiority of the Christian nations, taken in connection with the history of the world, we found, in ch. 4, proof that Jesus of Nazareth gave to men a religious impulse which has changed for good the entire course of human thought and life. To Him we turned, condemned for our past sins, seeking escape from their due penalty. The salvation we sought, we have found in His announcement of pardon for all who put faith in Him, and in His promise of a new life in the Spirit of God. Moreover, our faith has been verified by a joyful experience which is to us a foretaste of endless blessing. This vision of the future, dim yet glorious, we shall now further contemplate.

We shall find anticipations of retribution beyond the grave in the literature of various ancient nations, a few scanty intimations of it in the O.T., and much fuller teaching in Jewish writings shortly before the appearance of Christ. From all this we shall pass to the abundant and clear teaching of the New Testament.

477. Exact retribution beyond death for all actions done on earth, good and bad, underlies and permeates the thought of INDIA, ancient and modern. So Monier Williams, *Indian Wisdom* pp. 66-69: "In order to accomplish the entire working out of these consequences or 'ripenings of acts' as they are called, it is not enough that the personal soul goes to heaven or to hell. . . . The necessity for removal to a place of reward or punishment is indeed admitted; but this is not final or effectual. In order that the consequences of acts may be entirely worked out, the soul must leave heaven or hell and return to corporeal existence. Thus it has to pass through innumerable bodies, migrating into higher, intermediate, or lower forms, from a god to a demon, man, animal, or plant, or even a stone, according to its various shades of merit or demerit.

"This transmigration of the soul through a constant succession of bodies, which is as much a fixed and peremptory doctrine of Buddhism as of Hinduism, is to be regarded as the root of all evil. Moreover by it all the misery, inequality of fortune, and diversity of character in the world is to be explained. For even great genius, aptitude for special work, and innate excellence are not natural gifts, but the result of habits formed and powers developed through perhaps millions of previous existences. So again, sufferings of all kinds—weaknesses, sicknesses, and moral depravity—are simply the consequences of acts done by each soul, of its own free will, in former bodies, which acts exert on that soul an irresistible power."

478. For the EGYPTIANS, see *The Book of the Dead* ch. 31, rubric, trans. by Dr. Budge, curator of Egyptian antiquities in the British Museum: "If this chapter be known by the deceased, he shall come forth by day, he shall rise up and walk upon the earth among the living, and he shall never fail

and come to an end, never, never, never." In the same work, Introd. p. cvii., we read: "The evil heart, or the heart that has failed to balance the feather symbolic of the law, was given to the monster Ammit to devour; thus punishment consisted of instant annihilation, unless we imagine that the destruction of the heart was extended over an indefinite period."

Similarly Wiedemann's *Egyptian Doctrine of Immortality* p. 55, trans. by Grevel: "Nowhere are we clearly informed as to the fate of the condemned who could not stand before the god Osiris. We are told that the enemies of the gods perish, that they are destroyed or overthrown; but such vague expressions afford no certainty as to how far the Egyptians in general believed in the existence of a hell as a place of punishment or purification for the wicked; or whether, as seems more probable, they held some general belief that when judgment was pronounced against a man his heart and other immortal parts were not restored to him. For such a man no re-edification and no resurrection were possible. The immortal elements were divine, and by nature pure and imperishable; but they could be preserved from entering the Osiris, from re-entering the hull of the man who had proved himself unworthy of them. The soul, indeed, as such did not die, although personal annihilation was the lot of the evildoer in whom it had dwelt."

479. The Indian doctrine of transmigration reappears in PLATO. See his *Timæus* p. 42: "He who lived well during his appointed time was to return to the star which was his habitation and there he would have a blessed and suitable existence. But, if he failed in attaining this, in the second generation he would pass into a woman, and should he not desist from evil in that condition, he would be changed into some brute who resembled him in his evil ways." Also on

p. 91 : "The race of birds was created out of innocent light-minded men who, although their minds were directed toward heaven, imagined, in their simplicity, that the clearest demonstration of the things above was to be attained by sight; these were transformed into birds, and they grew feathers instead of hair. The race of wild pedestrian animals, again, came from those who had no philosophy in any of their thoughts, and never considered at all about the nature of the heavens."

A terrible vision of punishment of sin is given in Plato's *Republic* p. 615f : "For every wrong which they had done to any one they suffered tenfold. . . . If, for example, there were any who had been the cause of many deaths, or had betrayed or enslaved cities or armies, or been guilty of any other evil behaviour, for each and all of these they received punishment ten times over, and the rewards of beneficence and justice and holiness were in the same proportion. . . . Of piety and impiety to gods and parents, and of murderers, there were retributions other and greater far, which he described. He mentioned that he was present when one of the spirits asked another, Where is Ardiæus the Great? (Now this Ardiæus lived a thousand years before the time of Er : he had been the tyrant of some city in Pamphylia, and had murdered his aged father and his elder brother, and was said to have committed many other abominable crimes.) The answer was : 'He comes not hither and will never come. For,' said he, 'this was one of the dreadful sights which was witnessed by us. We were approaching the mouth of the cave, and, having seen all, were about to re-ascend, when of a sudden Ardiæus appeared and several others, most of whom were tyrants ; and there were also besides the tyrants private individuals who had been great criminals : they were just at the mouth, being, as they fancied, about to return

into the upper world, but the opening, instead of receiving them, gave forth a sound, when any of these incurable or unpunished sinners tried to ascend; and then men of wild aspect, who were standing by and knew what that meant, seized and carried off several of them, and Ardiæus and others they bound head and foot and hand, and threw them down and flayed them with scourges, and dragged them along the road at the side, carding them on thorns like wool, and declaring to the passers by what were their crimes, and that they were being taken away to be cast into Tartarus. . . . These,' said Er, 'were the penalties and punishments, and there were blessings as great.'"

In other words, we have here, as proportionate punishment of sin, torments similar to the most acute bodily suffering.

480. This expectation of judgment to come, which is found in the literature of all or nearly all ancient nations, and in modern heathenism, was evoked probably, and is easily explained, as we saw in § 17, by the INEQUALITY of retribution IN THE PRESENT LIFE, looked upon in the light of the supreme majesty of the inborn moral sense which forbids us to doubt that its commands will be vindicated by due reward and punishment, and that, since for such retribution there is not sufficient room in the present life, a further and perfect retribution awaits all men beyond the grave. The universality of this expectation suggests irresistibly that it is due, not to a special revelation like that given to Israel, but to facts before the eyes of all men, interpreted by a moral faculty common to all. These awful pictures of woe reveal the profound impression made on the minds of thoughtful Gentiles by the voice which speaks in the inborn moral sense, a voice speaking with an authority from which there is neither appeal nor escape.

481. Throughout the OLD TESTAMENT we find moral

retribution, as a dominating note. Everywhere man's welfare is conditioned by his right action. In the Pentateuch, we read frequently of rewards and punishments following obedience and sin: but these consist almost entirely of material benefits to the nation as a whole. The Prophets announce in most forceful terms that God will punish sin and bless the righteous: and retribution still more personal is conspicuous in the Bk. of Psalms. In the later books, retribution after death comes into view. The mysterious Bk. of Ecclesiastes closes with a solemn warning that "God will bring every work into judgment, with every hidden thing, whether it be good or evil;" suggesting irresistibly exact recompense such as is possible only beyond the grave. Still more definitely we read in Dan. 12^{1f} of a time to come when "many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to eternal life and some to shame, to eternal abhorrence." But, taken as a whole, the O.T., so superior to the teaching of the Egyptians, Hindus, and Greeks, in knowledge of one God, Maker and Ruler of all things and the righteous Judge and Saviour of men, presents a remarkable contrast to the teaching of these other ancient nations in its almost complete silence about retribution after death.

To this SILENCE, Christ is Himself a witness in Mt. 22^{31f}, where in reply to the Sadducees, He appeals, not to an express O.T. assertion, but only to God's words calling Himself "the God of Abraham;" and shows that these words imply a life beyond death. This appeal to indirect teaching suggests that the doctrine of a future life was, in the O.T., not taught directly. Perhaps it suggests a reason for this silence. God revealed Himself clearly to Israel as He did not to other nations; and seems, in His infinite wisdom, to have left them to infer from His own nature and love that the righteous dead live with Him.

482. In the BK. OF WISDOM (perhaps about B.C. 100) we have clear teaching about life beyond the grave for the righteous. So chs. 2^{23}-3^{8}: "God created man for incorruptibility; and made him an image of His own peculiar being. But by envy of the Devil death entered into the world: and they that are of his part make trial of it. But righteous men's souls are in God's hand and torment shall not touch them. In the eyes of fools they seemed to be dead, and their departure was reckoned an injury, and their going from us a calamity: but they are in peace. For even if in the sight of men they be punished, their hope is full of immortality; and having been chastened a little they will receive great benefits. Because God tried them, and found them worthy of Himself. As gold in a furnace He proved them; and as a whole burnt offering He accepted them. And in the time of their visitation they shall shine forth, and as sparks among stubble they shall run to and fro. They shall judge nations, and shall rule peoples: and the Lord shall be their King for ever."

Retribution beyond the grave is a conspicuous feature of the various parts of the BK. OF ENOCH: see § 491f. These books and others similar reveal a remarkable change which came over Jewish thought during the two centuries preceding the birth of Christ. Evidently, as hopes of political independence and glory faded from view, the heart of Israel turned towards a life to come. It is also worthy of note that then the Jews had come under Greek rule, and under the influence of Greek thought in which the teaching quoted in § 479 was a powerful factor.

483. In marked contrast to the silence of the O.T., we find in the NEW TESTAMENT frequent and conspicuous announcements of exact retribution for good and bad at a definite time after death. So John the Baptist in Mt. $3^{7\ 10,\ 12}$, etc. Also Christ, in Mt. 7^{23}, $13^{40\text{-}43,\ 49f}$, $16^{26,\ 27}$, $25^{31\text{-}46}$. The

phrase "eternal life" in Jno. $3^{15, 16, 36}$, $4^{14, 36}$, 5^{24}, $6^{27, 40, 47, 54}$, can only refer to a life beyond death; so ch. $5^{28, 29}$. Similarly Acts 17^{31}, 24^{25}; Rom. 2^{5-16}, 3^{6}, 8^{18}, 14^{10}, 1 Cor. 15^{51-54}, 2 Cor. 5^{10}, Gal. $6^{7,8}$, Ph. 4^{3}, 1 Th. 4^{17}, 5^{3}, 2 Th. 1^{6-9}, 2 Tim. 4^{18}; Heb. 6^{2}, 9^{27}, Rev. 20^{11-15}. These and other similar passages prove that the early followers of Christ expected exact retribution for all actions done on earth; and attributed this teaching to Him. The lowly homage with which they looked up to Him as their sublime Teacher forbids us to doubt for a moment that this teaching came actually from His lips. No fact in the history of human thought is more certain than that Christ announced conspicuously a judgment of all men, with due reward and punishment after death.

We have also found proof that this teaching of Christ was in some measure anticipated in the teaching of the Egyptians and in that of some of the Greeks, and in some Jewish writings from the ages preceding the appearance of Christ. That these last bear other indications of the influence of Greek thought, suggests irresistibly that this teaching was derived from the same source. In this as in other cases, Christ took over and used whatever knowledge of things unseen was already in the world, in Israel or among the Gentiles.

484. On the METHOD of retribution, light is shed in 1 Cor. 4^{5}, Rom. 13^{11-14}. Just as the morning light unveils much which lay hidden under the darkness of the night, so the light of the great day will reveal the real nature of actions done in the present life. Under a variety of disguises, we try to hide ourselves even from those who know us best: and in the dim twilight of our own inner life we lie partially hidden even from ourselves. For personal bias warps our judgment of our own actions and character. But the light of that day will reveal all. In 1 Cor. 3^{13f}, we have a still more searching metaphor: cp. 2 Cor. 5^{10}, Rev. 20^{12}.

This REVELATION will itself be, as these passages suggest, exact retribution. For, even in the imperfect knowledge of the present life, the approbation or condemnation of our fellows is no small reward or punishment. But in that day our actions will be known to all; and to ourselves. We shall be compelled, in the merciless light from which nothing can hide, to contemplate our sins and their far-reaching and terrible results, and to recognise all these as inevitable consequences of our own inexcusable folly and depravity. On the other hand, the faithful servants of Christ will, with wonder and with humble gratitude to Him who has wrought in them a good work, contemplate the blessed results of their own labour. This will be no small reward.

CHAPTER LV

THE PRESENT STATE OF THE DEPARTED

485. IN the passages quoted above, and throughout the N.T., retribution is represented as taking place, not at death, but at a definite time beyond it.

We come now to seek evidence touching the mysterious interval, or INTERMEDIATE STATE, between the close of probation on earth and the judgment of the great day.

In 1 Cor. $15^{6, 18, 51}$, 1 Th. 4^{14f}; 1 Cor. 15^{20}, 1 Th. 5^{10}, Jno. 11^{11}, the dead are represented as *sleeping*: so 1 Kgs. $11^{21, 43}$, etc.; Isa. 14^{8}; 2 Macc. 12^{45}; same thought in Homer's *Iliad* bk. 11^{240}, Sophocles' *Electra* l. 509, etc. This widespread conception is easily explained: for, to outward appearance and for a time, the dead differ from the

living chiefly as being in a deep sleep from which none can awake them.

This easy explanation forbids the inference that the dead are unconscious; that just as in sound sleep we pass at once from our last waking thoughts to the light of morning, so in our last long sleep we shall pass unconsciously from the dark shadow of death to the light of the Judgment Day. This inference is the more uncertain because frequently in bodily sleep an appearance of profound repose does but conceal the strange consciousness and activity of a dream. That the Greeks did not look on the sleep of death as unconscious, is proved by bk. 11 of the *Odyssey*, where the slain heroes are fully conscious and deplore their sad lot. We must seek other evidence.

486. Such evidence is SCANTY. The passing references in 2 Cor. 5^{6-8}, Ph. 1^{23}, Lk. 23^{43}, 9^{31}, 16^{28}, Rev. 6^{9f} suggest felt happiness or woe. But this suggestion lies open to the very serious objection that, if true, reward and punishment PRECEDE JUDGMENT; an order overturning all our conceptions of justice. For, if happiness or woe follow death immediately, a great assize, hundreds of years after death, would be unmeaning: yet throughout the N.T. the reward of the righteous and the punishment of the wicked are said to be, not at death, but simultaneously at the Great Day. This objection seems to me to have more weight than the above passing references: for, even though unconscious, the righteous dead are safe in the arms of Jesus, resting from the weariness and conflict of life, where none can hurt them. So after a hard day's work we are glad to sleep soundly till the morning light awakes us: and in our sleep we are "at home." The above passages, written for other purposes with no thought of the question before us, have less weight.

The CONSCIOUSNESS of the blessed dead is implied in the

exposition of Rev. 20^{1-6} suggested in § 516ff: but the meaning of these few very difficult verses is too uncertain to be made a basis of argument. On the other hand, the theory of unconsciousness lies open to the serious objection that it leaves no room for any probation beyond the grave, even for those, *e.g.* little children, who have had NO ADEQUATE PROBATION here: see § 598. For we cannot conceive that they will be lost; nor that in heaven there will be some who have had no conflict and who therefore cannot wear a victor's crown, while others have won the crown by faithfulness in severe trial. While gratefully accepting even dim rays of light, we must recognise that all details, touching our transition to the endless life so clearly announced for all faithful servants of Christ, lie hidden under a mystery which none can solve. The popular theory that the dead will at once enter their final reward or punishment is contradicted by the plain and abundant N.T. teaching that in the Last Day they will go forth from their graves to judgment. This implies an intermediate state. But any theory touching it lies open to serious objection. On the other hand, abundant and various evidence, excluding all doubt, assures us that exact retribution beyond the grave awaits all men for all actions done on earth, good and bad; and that the righteous dead are at peace.

CHAPTER LVI

THE SECOND COMING OF CHRIST: EARLIER TEACHING

487. SINCE the full revelation recorded in the N.T. is a DEVELOPMENT of preliminary revelations, and comes to us through the agency of men whose THOUGHTS and PHRASEOLOGY were moulded by these earlier revelations, I shall now discuss certain teaching and phraseology of the O.T. and of later Jewish writers bearing on the subject before us.

488. JOEL announces a calamity about to overwhelm the nation, in consequence of their sins, which he compares to the approach of an irresistible army consuming everything in its path: the time of its approach, he calls the DAY OF JEHOVAH: chs. 1^{15}, 2^{1-11}. Then follow an exhortation to repentance, and a promise of deliverance and of a wonderful outpouring of the Spirit of God upon all flesh at the coming of the terrible day of Jehovah: ch. 2^{28-31} (3^{1-4}, Heb.). Cp. ch. 3^{14f} Eng. The prophecy closes with an announcement of abiding blessing for Zion.

The occurrence of the phrase *day of Jehovah* five times in the short book of Joel gives to this phrase marked prominence. Evidently the prophet looked forward to a definite time of conspicuous punishment for the wicked, accompanied or followed by conspicuous blessing for the righteous.

Same phrase three times in Amos 5^{18-20}, evidently describing a time when God will inflict punishment. Cp. Isa. 2^{11-17}: very similar to Joel 1^{15}, 2^{1-11} is Isa. 13^{6-10}. So Obad. ^{15}, Zeph. 1^{7-16}, Ezek. 13^{5}, 30^{3f}. In Zech. 12-14, the phrase *in that day* occurs some 15 times, noting a definite time

of retribution and blessing. The Bks. of the Prophets conclude in Mal. 4^{5} Eng. with words reproducing Joel 2^{31}.

In all these places, the "day of Jehovah" is a time of CONSPICUOUS execution of PUNISHMENT against sin both in Israel and in her enemies. During long periods of forbearance, sinners seemed to have their own day of high-handed rebellion. But the prophets foresaw that in His own time the unseen God will come forth from His hiding-place and vindicate the majesty of His forgotten authority: and this time, definite to their thought, they called *Jehovah's Day*.

In many places where this term is not found, O.T. prophecy culminates in complete VICTORY OF GOOD over evil, manifesting itself in punishment and downfall of sinners however mighty and in great blessing for the righteous, this latter not unfrequently described in terms of loftiest grandeur. The deep faith in God thus revealed is a conspicuous difference between the O.T. and all contemporary literature.

489. Very different from the above, in phraseology and modes of thought, yet in full harmony with it, is the BK. OF DANIEL. The vision in ch. 2 shows us a succession of empires culminating in, and overthrown by, an empire set up by God and never to be destroyed. In ch. $7^{13, 14}$, after a vision of four beasts rising successively from the sea, we see One "like a SON OF MAN," *i.e.* in human form, distinct from the "Ancient of Days," yet coming "with clouds of the heavens," to whom was given an "eternal dominion." In ch. 12^{1}, after various political convulsions, in time of unparalleled trouble but of deliverance for those written in the book of God, we have a vision of "Michael, the great prince who stands for the sons of Thy people." In $v.^{2}$: "And many that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to eternal life, and some to shame, to eternal abhorrence." This can be no other than a resurrection of the dead, good

and bad: and this vision of judgment forms the distant horizon of the prophet's farthest thought.

The Bk. of Daniel differs from other O.T. prophetic books in that (1) it takes us definitely WITHIN THE VEIL to an entirely new order of things; that (2) the Kingdom which is to supersede all earthly kingdoms is given to One who, though from heaven, is distinct from the Supreme and wears a human form; and that (3) it announces clearly a resurrection of the dead and a final reward and punishment beyond the grave. This difference is one of many indications of its later date. But various O.T. prophetic writers announce a Kingdom of glory to be set up more or less suddenly by power from heaven on the ruins of all earthly kingdoms, from which all evil and all sinners shall be excluded, the eternal home of faithful servants of God.

490. Any one who turns from the O.T. prophets, *e.g.* Joel or Isaiah, to N.T. Eschatology is at once conscious of an immense gulf passed. For crossing this gulf, the Bk. of Daniel affords a starting-point. But between it and the N.T. is a wide interval of thought. Some help to bridge it, we shall find in Jewish works written during the interval, and especially in BK. OF ENOCH. For this, I shall use the admirable English edition (A.D. 1893) of R. H. Charles. The following quotations are from chs. 37-71, an integral, and probably the latest, part of the work, written perhaps between B.C. 94-79. They are samples of the teaching of the whole.

491. Ch. 46^{1-6}: "And there I saw One who had a head of days, and his head was white like wool, and with him was another being whose countenance had the appearance of a man (cp. Dan. 7^{13}) and his face was full of graciousness, like one of the holy angels. And I asked the angel who went with me and showed me all the hidden things,

concerning that Son of Man, who he was, and whence he was, and why he went with the Head of Days? And he answered and said unto me, 'This is the Son of Man, who hath righteousness, with whom dwelleth righteousness, and who revealeth all the treasures of that which is hidden, because the Lord of Spirits hath chosen him, and his lot before the Lord of Spirits hath surpassed everything in uprightness for ever. And this Son of Man whom thou hast seen will arouse the kings and the mighty ones from their couches and the strong from their thrones, and will loosen the reins of the strong and grind to powder the teeth of sinners. And he will put down the kings from their thrones and kingdoms because they do not extol and praise him, nor thankfully acknowledge whence the kingdom was bestowed upon them. And he will put down the countenance of the strong, and shame will cover them, darkness will be their dwelling and worms their bed, and they will have no hope of rising from their beds because they do not extol the name of the Lord of Spirits."

Ch. 47^{3}: "And in those days I saw the Head of Days when he had seated himself on the throne of his glory, and the books of the living were opened before him, and his whole host which is in heaven above and around him stood before him."

Ch. 48^{2-6}: "And at that hour that the Son of Man was named in the presence of the Lord of Spirits, and his name before the Head of Days. And before the sun and the signs were created, before the stars of the heaven were made, his name was named before the Lord of Spirits. He will be a staff to the righteous on which they will support themselves and not fall, and he will be the light of the Gentiles and the hope of those who are troubled of heart. All who dwell on earth will fall down and bow the knee before him, and

will bless and laud and celebrate with song the Lord of Spirits." Lower down we read of the wicked, "I will give them over into the hands of Mine elect: as straw in fire and as lead in water they will burn before the face of the holy, and sink before the face of the righteous, and no trace of them will any more be found . . . for they have denied the Lord of Spirits and his Anointed." The writer continues in ch. 49^{2-4}: "for he is mighty in all the secrets of righteousness, and unrighteousness will disappear as a shadow, and have no continuance, because the Elect One standeth before the Lord of Spirits, and his glory is for ever and ever, and his might unto all generations. And in him dwells the spirit of wisdom and the spirit of him who gives knowledge, and the spirit of understanding, and of might, and the spirit of those who have fallen asleep in righteousness. And he will judge the secret things, and no one will be able to utter a lying word before him; for he is the Elect One before the Lord of Spirits, according to his good pleasure."

492. In ch. 51^{1-5} we read of a resurrection of body and soul followed by judgment. "And in those days will the earth also give back those who are treasured up within it, and Sheol also will give back that which it has received, and hell will give back that which it owes. And he will choose the righteous and holy from among them; for the day of their redemption has drawn nigh. And the Elect One will in those days sit on my throne, and all the secrets of wisdom will stream forth from the counsels of his mouth; for the Lord of Spirits hath given it to him and hath glorified him. And in those days will the mountains leap like rams and the hills will skip like lambs satisfied with milk, and they will all become angels in heaven. Their faces will be lighted up with joy because in those days the Elect One hath appeared, and the earth will rejoice and

the righteous will dwell upon it, and the elect will go to and fro upon it."

Ch. 62^{5-9}: "Pain will seize them when they see that Son of Man sitting on the throne of his glory. . . . For the Son of Man was hidden before him, and the Most High preserved him in the presence of his might, and revealed him to the elect. . . . And all the kings and the mighty and the exalted and those that rule the earth will fall down on their faces before him and worship, and set their hope upon that Son of Man, and will petition him and supplicate for mercy at his hands."

In an earlier part of the book, ch. $10^{6, 12}$, which we have in a fragment of an early Greek translation, and in chs. 19^{1}, $22^{4, 11}$, we read of "the day of judgment" and "the great day of judgment," and the "day of their judgment," and "the great day of judgment and punishment and torture of the revilers for ever."

493. The CHIEF VALUE of the Bk. of Enoch and of some other similar works is that they reveal the development in Jewish thought during the century before Christ, in the direction of the teaching of the N.T., of teaching found in the O.T. only in a few passages in the Bk. of Daniel. In Dan. 7^{31} we see on the throne one distinct from the Most High, and said to be "like a son of man." So in Enoch: but there the Judge is frequently and definitely spoken of as "the Son of Man;" and we read that before the sun and stars were created, his name was named before the Lord of Spirits. We also find, much more frequently and definitely than in the O.T., retribution beyond the grave in a day of universal judgment. Evidently, during the long and sad interval between the last of the O.T. prophets and the rousing voice of the Baptist, the heart of Israel turned, amid surrounding gloom, to a life beyond the grave: and,

while so doing, their hopes gathered round One whom they conceived as bearing a human form yet coming from heaven.

CHAPTER LVII

THE SECOND COMING OF CHRIST: THE NEW TESTAMENT

494. THE TEACHING OF PAUL. Notice 1 Th. 1^{10}. In chs. 2^{19}, 3^{13}, 4^{15}, 5^{23}, 2 Th. $2^{1,8}$, 1 Cor. 15^{23}; as in Jas. $5^{7,8}$, 1 Jno. 2^{28}, Mt. $24^{3,27,37,39}$; we find the conspicuous word *παρουσία* (PAROUSIA), which denotes, like the cognate verb *πάρεστι*, the *presence* of some one standing by. So 2 Cor. 10^{10}, and Ph. 2^{12} where it is contrasted with *ἀπουσία* as *presence* with *absence*: also 1 Cor. 16^{17}, 2 Cor. 7^{6f}, Ph. 1^{26}, where it denotes the presence of a fresh arrival. This use of the same word in same reference by various N.T. writers proves it to be a technical term of the early Christians denoting their Master's expected return. In bodily form, He is now absent in heaven: on that day He will be visibly present on earth.

The GRAPHIC DESCRIPTION in 1 Th. 4^{16f} proves that the word denotes, in this and similar passages, not spiritual intercourse in the unseen world, but a bodily arrival of Christ. "The dead . . . will rise *first*: *then* the living ones . . . will be caught up." This emphasizes the priority of the rising of the dead; and thus confirms the last words of *v.*^{15}. This simple and complete explanation forbids us to infer that the dead without Christ shall rise later. Of the wicked, nothing is here said. We have only the shout, the descent, the resurrection of the dead in Christ, and the snatching up of His living servants to meet Him in the air.

495. The words DAY OF THE LORD in 1 Th. 5^2 are the LXX. rendering of the *day of Jehovah* as quoted in § 488. They denote evidently the return of Christ already mentioned, as above: and, if so, *v.*^{3} asserts that His coming, which to His servants, dead and living, will be a reunion with their Lord, will be to others "sudden destruction." This is in close agreement with the above O.T. passages where the *day of Jehovah* is described as a time of punishment for the wicked and of blessing for the righteous. It implies that at Christ's coming there will be sin and sinners on earth. Then follows a beautiful metaphor based on the word *day*. Same metaphor in Rom. $13^{11\text{-}13}$. In contrast to the "*Day* of the Lord," the present life seemed to Paul but the passing hours of a *night*. Already to the eye of faith the dawning light proclaims that the day is near. He bids his readers walk as sons of Light and of Day.

496. In 2 Th. 1^6, written to correct, apparently, a misunderstanding of his earlier letter, Paul speaks of a just recompense for good and bad at the REVELATION or *unveiling* of Christ. He is now hidden from our view; but in that day the veil will be rent, and the hidden One will appear: *i.e.* His coming will be not only audible, as in 1 Th. 4^{16}, but visible. He will come "from heaven," accompanied by heavenly ministers of His power, and by "fire," the most searching of natural forces. In 2 Th. 1^{8f}, the persons to be punished and their penalty are further described: the words *in that day* (cp. Isa. 2^{11}, Zech. 12^3, etc.) are another link between (N.T.) the "day of the Lord" and (O.T.) the "day of Jehovah."

In 2 Th. 2^2, Paul warns his readers against supposing that the "day of the Lord has come," *i.e.* is now beginning; thus linking together the *Parousia*, and the Day of the Lord. It will not come till "the APOSTACY come first;" there will be no revelation of the Lord Jesus till "the man of sin be

revealed:" chs. 1^{7}, 2^{3}. This last is then further described. The use of the words *revealed* and *parousia* (ch. 2^{9}) to describe the advent of Christ and that of the "son of destruction" places these two antagonistic forces in conspicuous and awful contrast. The course of events is further described in ch. $2^{7.8}$. In marked contrast to this revelation of evil, we are told that "*the mystery* of lawlessness is already working," but under restraint. When this restraint is removed, it will be *revealed*, *i.e.* will work, no longer secretly, but openly. This revelation marks a conspicuous development of evil on earth. What it will be, we know not except as it is here dimly shadowed forth. But these words imply that at the visible appearance of Christ a new and terrible form of evil will be in power, an activity of Satan, claiming divine honours and deluding those who reject the light of the Gospel; and that it will fade into nothing at the voice and appearance of Christ.

497. Such is the CLEAR and harmonious TEACHING of the Epp. to the THESSALONIANS. Paul was looking for a definite time when Christ will audibly and visibly return from heaven to earth, to raise His dead servants, to welcome all His servants dead and living into endless and blessed intercourse with Himself, and to destroy all who refuse to obey the Gospel. He taught also that the revelation of Christ, who is now hidden from our view, will be preceded by an outward manifestation, in some new and awful form, of that evil which is already secretly operating among men, and that this new manifestation of it will continue in power till it be dethroned by the appearance of Christ.

498. Similar teaching in Paul's OTHER LETTERS; but not equally prominent. So 1 Cor. $1^{7.8}$, 4^{5}, 11^{26}; also 3^{13}, in close agreement with 2 Th. 1^{8}. As in 1 Th. $4^{14.16}$, so in 1 Cor. $15^{20\text{-}23}$. Paul speaks only of the servants of Christ; so especially in *v.*^{43}, words true only of the saved. This

forbids us to infer that at His coming only His servants will rise. In *vv.*[50-57] we have a definite "moment" and again (1 Th. 4[16]) the sound of a "trumpet," never to be repeated: after which the dead will rise. As before, their rising will affect the living: and we now learn that these last will be "changed," a change made needful by the constitution of their bodies which unfits them for the final consummation. Their resurrection is bodily: *v.*[44]; so Rom. 8[11], Ph. 3[21]. Consequently Christ's resurrection must also have been bodily: for a merely spiritual manifestation after death could not remove objections (cp. *vv.*[13-17]) to a bodily resurrection of believers. And, if so, His return to earth must also be BODILY. In other words, Paul expected that the sacred body raised (Rom. 8[34]) from the grave to heaven will in that day return from heaven to earth. All this does not imply that the risen bodies of believers will contain the particles of matter laid in the grave. Indeed, these do not continue the same during life. But it implies that our spirits will again clothe themselves in material forms, related probably, in some way to us inconceivable but real, to the bodies laid in the grave.

499. In 1 Cor. 15[51], 1 Th. 4[15], Paul puts HIMSELF AMONG those who will SURVIVE Christ's return. This implies fairly that he did not know that long ages would elapse before that time. But we have no right to infer that he had a definite and confident expectation that he would survive to that day: for in rhetorical figure, *e.g.* Rom. 3[7], he often identifies himself with that which he describes. Probably hope and fear alternated with his circumstances and frame of mind, *e.g.* 2 Cor. 5[6-8], where, influenced perhaps by the deadly peril in ch. 1[9], he ponders the possibility of death. Still, finding himself preserved from day to day, and not knowing how soon Christ will appear, he spoke (1 Th. 4[15])

of himself as, in contrast to his departed brethren, "being left for the coming of the Lord."

This hope, thus faintly expressed, was not dispelled by Paul's knowledge that the appearance of "the lawless one" must precede Christ's coming. For, the wonderful events of the last thirty years permitted a hope that the remainder of his life might suffice for the appearance and short reign of "the man of sin," and for his destruction by the appearance of Christ. In any case, the hope which finds indefinite expression in these two passages is no essential part of, and its failure does nothing to cast doubt on, Paul's plain and abundant and conspicuous teaching that Christ will return to raise the dead and to judge all men.

Notice that the clearest expression of this hope is in the EARLIEST of Paul's letters; the only other expression of it, in the earliest, probably, of the second group. In another letter (2 Cor. 5^{6-8}) of the same group, he weighs the possibility of death, and still more seriously (Ph. 1^{22-25}) in one of a later group. In 2 Tim. 4^{6}, he contemplates the near approach of death. In Acts $20^{24, 29}$, before his arrest at Jerusalem, he speaks of his own death as certain. This proves that the historian, probably a companion of Paul, did not believe that at that time Paul expected to survive the coming of Christ. These references to his death have more weight than have the two casual allusions quoted above.

500. Further teaching in harmony with the above is found in 2 Cor. 4^{14}, 5^{10}, Rom. $2^{5, 16}$, (on chs. 8^{19-23}, 11^{25f} see my *Commentary*,) Ph. 1^{6}, 3^{11} (suggesting a removal of the risen ones *from* among the *dead* cp. Lk. 20^{35}, Acts 4^{2}, 1 Pet. 1^{3}) Ph. 3^{20f}, Eph. 4^{30}, Col. 3^{4}; also, in the last group of letters, 1 Tim. 6^{14}, Tit. 2^{13}, 2 Tim. $1^{12, 18}$, $4^{1, 8}$, cp. 1^{10}. Similar teaching in the addresses recorded in Acts 17^{31}, 24^{15}.

Comparison will prove that Paul's teaching about Christ's return is, both in phraseology and thought, the SAME IN ALL his letters. Indeed, their chronological order does not reveal in this subject, as it does in some others, development of thought, except that lapse of time destroyed his hope of himself surviving the return of Christ. Otherwise his thoughts on this topic were fully developed when he wrote his earliest epistles. Notice his technical terms, *revelation*, *appearance*, *day of the Lord*; and, also in other N.T. writers, *parousia*.

501. The larger place occupied by the subject before us in Paul's letters to RECENT CONVERTS (*e.g.* 1 Th. 1^{10}) as compared with those to older churches, suggests that he looked on this topic as among the RUDIMENTS of the Christian faith. At Thessalonica (Acts 17^{3}) he preached that Jesus is the Anointed Deliverer and had risen from the dead; adding doubtless (cp. Acts 13^{38}), that through Him is proclaimed pardon of sins for all who put faith in Him. It was easy to add (1 Th. 5^{1}) that He who was raised from the dead will return to reward or punish those who accept or reject His offered salvation. But, as converts multiplied, they would need other teaching about the practical bearing of the Gospel on the details of personal and social life. This more varied teaching would leave less room in his later letters, as there was less need, for a topic already sufficiently understood. Moreover, the large space occupied in 1 Thess. was due apparently to sorrow caused by the unexpected death of some church-members: and 2 Thess. was written in part to correct (ch. 2^{2}) a misunderstanding.

The Second Coming of Christ can scarcely be reckoned among the great FUNDAMENTAL doctrines of the Gospel. In the systematic exposition given in the Ep. to Romans, it has no prominent place; and only passing mention in the profound Epp. to Ephesians and Colossians. But, though

subordinate, it is, as we have seen, an essential part of the Gospel of Paul. Much less important is Paul's faint hope, found only in two passing phrases, of himself surviving Christ's return.

502. We may now SUM UP with complete confidence, resting upon documents coming certainly (cp. § 34) from his pen, the belief of the greatest of the apostles of Christ touching the future. Pau looked forward apparently to continued progress of the Gospel, to the ingathering of the fulness of the Gentiles and then of Israel. But beyond this progress, he foresaw an awful manifestation, in a new and conspicuous form, of evil already working in the wicked. This new revelation of evil, in the moment of its power, Christ will dethrone and destroy by His sudden and audible and visible appearance from heaven. At His coming, His dead servants will wake up from their long sleep; and, with the changed forms of those still living, will enter into the eternal and glorious Kingdom of Christ and of God.

503. THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS. The phrase *that day* already found in 2 Th. 1^{10}, 2 Tim. $1^{12, 18}$, 4^{8}, occurs again in the same sense in Mt. 7^{22}, 24^{36}, Mk. 13^{32}, Lk. 10^{12}, 17^{31}, 21^{34}. This reveals the definite place of the *day* of judgment in the writers' thought. Mt. 10^{23} recalls Dan. 7^{13}, and the Bk. of Enoch; as does the frequent use of the term *Son of Man* in reference to His return to judge the world. That the word *come* is considered sufficient to indicate our Lord's meaning, proves that His coming was already familiar. It is depicted in plain language in Mt. $13^{40\text{-}43}$.

Still more definite is Mt. 16^{27f}. The words *shall come* in *v.*^{27} denote evidently His coming to judge the world: and it is difficult to give any other meaning to the word *coming* in *v.*^{28}. Yet nothing happened in the lifetime of the men

standing round which could be described as "see the Son of Man coming in His Kingdom." Certainly, at the destruction of Jerusalem, He did not "give to each one according to his action."

This DIFFICULTY is somewhat relieved by Mk. 9^{1}, "till they see the Kingdom of God come in power;" and Lk. 9^{27}, "till they see the Kingdom of God." The context leaves no room for doubt that these three narratives report the same discoures. Now the second and third phrases describe appropriately the events of the Day of Pentecost, when the apostles saw the Kingdom of God actually set up on earth in a manner unknown before, and amid a wonderful manifestation of God's power. If this exposition be correct, Mk. 8^{38} and 9^{1} (so Lk. $9^{26, 27}$) refer to different events: Mt. 16^{27} and ^{28} refer indisputably to the same event. The only explanation I can suggest is that Mk. and Lk. reproduce more correctly the words actually spoken by Christ; and that Mt. 16^{28} was coloured by the eager hope of the early followers of Christ for their Master's speedy return.

504. The hope thus expressed is a sure indication of EARLY DATE: for no one in the 2nd cent., when the last survivor of Christ had long ago passed away, would have put these words into His lips. And the early date of the First Gospel, thus proved, greatly increases its value as a witness of what Christ actually did and said. If He spoke the words in Mk. 9^{1}, Lk. 9^{27}, we can easily see how contemporaries, confusing two distinct events, each of them still future, attributed to Him the words in Mt. 16^{28}, words differing in form so little, in meaning so much, from those which He seems to have used. But this confusion would have been impossible after Christ's meaning had been made clear by events. This important evidence compensates abundantly for the difficulty before us Similarly, the casual allusion in

Mt. 10^{23} could not have been made after the land of Israel had for more than a generation been depopulated of its ancient inhabitants.

505. In Lk. 17^{22-37}, our Lord teaches, in close agreement with 1 Th. 5^{3}, 2 Th. 1^{7}, 2^{9f}, that His coming will be to the wicked a sudden and overwhelming DESTRUCTION, and will be preceded by general demoralisation.

In the discourse recorded in Mt. 24, Mk. 13, Lk. 21^{5-36}, the disciples show Christ the beautiful buildings of the temple, and He foretells a time when not one stone will be left on another. They ask, "When?" Mt. adds, "What shall be the sign of Thy COMING and of the completion of the age?" The word *parousia* recalls the same word in same sense in Paul's letters. The term *completion of the age* (so Mt. $13^{39, 40, 49}$, 28^{0}) denotes evidently the same event. Christ replies by a vista of tumults and persecutions, the Gospel "preached in all the world" and "then the end." Then follows a practical direction for flight "to the mountains," and an announcement of unheard-of tribulation, of slaughter and captivity, and (Lk. 21^{24}) of "Jerusalem trodden down by Gentiles, till the seasons of the Gentiles be fulfilled." Next comes an announcement of a dissolution of nature and of an appearance of Christ in the sky, followed by His angels gathering together His people, with (Mt. 24^{31}) sound of a trumpet (as in 1 Th. 4^{16}, 1 Cor. 15^{52}), from the ends of the earth.

506. An important TURNING-POINT, in Mt. 24^{32}, Mk. 13^{28}, Lk. 21^{29}, is the parable of the fig tree putting forth young shoots as harbingers of approaching summer; and the assertion, "this *generation* shall not pass away till all these things take place." The word γενεά can refer only to the men living in Christ's day. At first sight, the words *all these things* seem to include the appearance of Christ from heaven. But this

impression is somewhat modified by Mt. 24^{36}, Mk. 13^{32}: for here the day of His return, which is unknown even to the Son, stands in conspicuous contrast to events which will happen during the present generation. The word ἐκείνης (*that*) points conspicuously to something at a distance. This contrast suggests that "all these things" refers to the fall of Jerusalem; and Mt. $24^{3\text{-}6}$, Mk. 13^{32}, to the coming of Christ. This explanation, however, removes the difficulty in Mt. 24 and Mk. 13 only partially, and does not touch that in Lk. 21. All three reports of this important discourse seem to be coloured by the eager hopes of the first generation of the followers of Christ: and this bears witness to the very early date of the tradition embodied in the Synoptic Gospels.

Then follows in Mt. and Mk. a comparison with the flood; as in Lk. $17^{26f.}$ In Mt. 25^{5}, and ^{19}, Christ is represented as lingering: another indication of delay in His return, among indications that it was near. This apparent contradiction is easily explained by the uncertainty of the early Christians about an eagerly expected day still future. In *vv.*$^{31\text{-}46}$, we have another description of the coming of Christ to judge all men good and bad; in close agreement with the teaching of Paul.

507. The coming of Christ to JUDGE the world is one of the most conspicuous features of the First Gospel: and, with the exception of somewhat varying indications of the earlier or later time of His return, the picture is harmonious throughout. Equally harmonious and scarcely less conspicuous, is the teaching of Mark and Luke. Still more remarkable, considering the wide difference in forms of expression and modes of thought, is the close agreement, in thought and diction, of all these documents with the letters of Paul. The only real differences are that the hope of an early return of Christ which in Paul's letters finds only faint expression in

two ambiguous passages, finds in Mark and Luke, and especially in Mt., much more definite expression; and that the new and terrible form of evil foretold by Paul is in these Gospels only suggested by a comparison of the days before Christ's return with those before the flood. The eager desire of some of His followers anticipated their Lord's coming as close at hand: but the sober thought of Paul warns them that before He comes there must first come an embodiment of evil in its most awful form.

The same teaching is found in Acts 1^{11}, $3^{19\text{-}21}$, 10^{42}; also 17^{31}, 24^{15}. Similar thought and phraseology in Jas. $5^{7\text{-}9}$; 1 Pet. $1^{5,\ 7,\ 13}$, $4^{5\text{-}7,\ 13}$, $5^{1,\ 4}$. These passages prove that Paul's thoughts and words were shared by the Galilean apostles.

508. In Jno. $5^{25\text{-}29}$, we have, with stately repetition, TWO PARALLEL ASSERTIONS marked by conspicuous points of similarity and difference. Note the phrase *an hour comes* referring, as in ch. $4^{21,\ 23}$, to the Gospel dispensation close at hand; in ch. 16^{2} to the coming persecutions of Christ's servants; in *v.*^{25} to the fuller manifestation of Christ to His disciples; and in *v.*^{32} to their dispersal at His arrest. In ch. 5^{25} He adds *and now is*; but not in *v.*^{28}: an important distinction. The former describes the immediate effect of the Gospel: the latter refers to an event future even to us. Believers have already (*v.*^{24}) "passed out of death into life:" and, by raising into new life those only who hear His voice, the Son performs an act of "judgment." The words *and now is* call attention to a new era created by the Gospel.

The astonishment evoked by this announcement, Christ removes, or supersedes, by a still more astonishing announcement: "an hour comes" in the future "when ALL that are IN THE GRAVES will hear His voice and will go forth." The word *all* differentiates this statement from the foregoing.

But, though "*all* will go forth" from "the graves," not *all* will "*live*:" for only "they who have done the good things" will go forth "to a resurrection of *life*." Notice here two very different resurrections, each caused by the voice of Christ, one present and spiritual, in which they who accept the Gospel enter at once into spiritual life; and another still future, when all the bodies laid "in the graves" will go forth, to life or to judgment according to their works. Cp. chs. $6^{39, 40, 44, 54}$, 11^{24}, where the words "at the last day" throw forward the resurrection of the just to the end of the present order of things: so 1 Cor. 15^{52}, "the last trumpet."

The words "till I COME" in Jno. 21^{22} recall Mt. 10^{23}, 16^{27}, etc., 2 Th. 1^{10}, 1 Cor. 11^{26}, etc. That they were taken to mean "that that disciple does not die," implies that the apostles understood the coming of Christ here mentioned to be the close of the present order of things.

509. Up to this point we have found complete AGREEMENT between the various types of N.T. writers. Paul teaches that at a voice from heaven the dead servants of Christ will rise, that all men will stand before him in judgment, and that He will change the bodies of the just into the likeness of His own glorified body. The Synoptic Gospels represent Christ as teaching frequently that He will come from heaven with power and splendour, and sit in judgment on the righteous and the wicked: and in Jno. 5^{28f} He asserts that at His voice all the dead will rise and receive according to their works.

510. OTHER TEACHING different from, yet in full harmony with, the above meets us in Jno. 14^{18-20}, $16^{16, 22, 23, 26}$. These words, in their full sense, refer evidently to the gift of the Spirit promised so conspicuously in chs. $14^{16, 17}$, 16^{13-15}, immediately before the words quoted above. They were

abundantly fulfilled on the day of Pentecost. Christ then entered into a fellowship with His disciples far closer than that which they enjoyed during His life on earth; and in this real and important sense He returned to them after the separation caused by His death. We have here an inward and spiritual coming of Christ: and, since this closer union was conditioned by His resurrection, we may call this last the beginning of this spiritual return. In other words, the fulfilment of His promise to return began at His resurrection, and was completed on the day of Pentecost. This spiritual return was an inward anticipation of the bodily return for which His disciples were waiting.

511. As an anticipation of an early return of Christ, 1 Jno. 2^{18} recalls Mt. 16^{28}, 1 Th. 4^{15}. The ABSENCE of the ARTICLE twice (ἐσχάτη ὥρα ἐστίν) indicates that the writer's day was marked by the characteristics of a *last hour*. This suggests that it was the latest part of the present order of things. That the word *hour* is used to describe so long a period, warns us not to press it elsewhere as indicating a short period. But the Gospel dispensation, however long, is homogeneous. During the whole of it, amid various developments, God governs the world on the same method. The words, "Antichrist comes, even now many antichrists," are in close agreement with 2 Th. $2^{7, 8}$.

The SCANTINESS of the teaching of the Fourth Gospel on the topic before us, as compared with the other three, recalls the scantiness of such teaching in the 2nd and 3rd groups of Paul's letters as compared with the 1st group. In each case, the development of church life absorbed the writer's attention from other topics. But in all these documents we find complete harmony.

512. Plain references to Christ's return to judge the world

are found in Rev. 1^{7} (cp. Dan. 7^{13}), Rev. 3^{11}, 22^{20}. In chs. $2^{5, 16}$, 3^{3} are warnings of punishment to be inflicted, not at one definite moment at the close of the present order of things, but during the course of history; similar to the conspicuous national punishment in the "day of the Lord" foretold by the O.T. prophets.

The word *quickly* in Rev. 3^{11}, $22^{7, 12, 20}$, in ch. 1^{1} repeated word for word in ch. 22^{6}, cp. ch. 1^{3}; recalls Mt. 10^{23}, 16^{28}, Jas. 5^{9}, 1 Pet. 4^{7}, 1 Jno. 2^{18}, and suggests an early return of Christ, thus revealing an expectation not justified, in the form in which it was held, by subsequent events. This UNFULFILLED EXPECTATION presents a difficulty I cannot remove. But it does not invalidate other plain and abundant N.T. teaching.

513. The first four SEALS (Rev. 6^{1-8}) open to us what seem to be consecutive historical pictures. At the 5th seal, we pass within the veil and hear impatient voices of the souls of the martyrs. The 6th seal opens to us a vision of the dissolution of nature, and we hear the cry of the lost that "the great day of their anger is come." This can be no other than a picture of the final judgment. It is followed in ch. 7 by a vision of the saved. At the 7th seal (ch. 8^{1}) there is silence in heaven, marking a pause in the visions; and we see seven angels with seven trumpets.

With the TRUMPETS begins another series of apparently consecutive visions. But this second series as a whole does not seem to follow, but to run parallel with, the first series. For the total dissolution of nature under the 6th seal cannot be followed by the partial destruction described under the first four trumpets. The second series, like the first, leads up to the great consummation: so Rev. 11^{15}; also ch. 14^{14}, recalling Dan. 7^{13}. In ch. 16 we have a third series, of BOWLS; evidently, like the seven trumpets, parallel to the

seven seals and leading up to the great consummation. This consummation of judgment and blessing is delineated in chs. 17, 18 and ch. 19^{1-8}.

514. From chs. 19^{11}, 21^{8}, we have a series of visions each introduced by the phrase AND I SAW, in chs. $19^{11, 17, 19}$, $20^{1, 4, 11}$, 21^{1}; followed in chs. 21^{9-27}, 22^{1-5} by visions of the heavenly Jerusalem and the River of Life. All these seem to be consecutive: and they lead up to the final glory.

The first vision (ch. 19^{11-16}) takes us back into the conflict, and shows us One seated on a white horse and leading forth to battle the armies of heaven. Before His advance ($v.^{20}$) fall the beast and the false prophet into the lake of fire. The easiest explanation is that this picture delineates the struggle and victory and progress of the Gospel of Christ.

In ch. 20^{1} opens another vision, a sequel to those in ch. 19^{11-21}. An ANGEL DESCENDS from heaven, binds the serpent, and casts him into the abyss for a thousand years; after which long time he must needs be loosed for "a little time." The prophet adds, "and I saw thrones and persons sat upon them, and judgment was given to them." He saw also "the souls of those beheaded because of the testimony of Jesus and because of the word of God." It is not clear whether the words following, "such as did not worship the beast neither his image," are a further description of the martyrs, or describe another class of persons wider than they, viz. the faithful servants of Christ. In the absence of any limitation, this wider interpretation is better. These persons "lived," *i.e.* "were alive" when the prophet saw their "souls," though some of them had been "beheaded" and all were undoubtedly dead: and they "reigned with Christ a thousand years." But this does not imply that they began to live at the beginning of the 1000 years; any more than it implies that they ceased to live at the close. During the whole

time that Satan was bound, the souls of the martyrs were living with Christ. The 1000 years note an extension, not necessarily a limitation, of time.

"The rest of the dead did not live:" *i.e.* they had not, as the martyrs had, a higher life which survived the death of the body. The words following, "till the 1000 years were completed," do not suggest that at the close of this long period they came to life. The assertion is purely negative. During the whole 1000 years, while the servants of Christ lived and reigned with Him, the rest of mankind remained in death. But we are not told either that they came to life, or that the saints ceased to live, at the end of the period.

Verses 5^b, ^{6} reveal the significance of *v.*^{4}. "The FIRST RESURRECTION" stands in marked contrast to "the second death;" and suggests a later resurrection, which is described in *vv.*$^{12, 13}$. This recalls Jno. 5^{25-29}, where similarly two resurrections are placed side by side. The life enjoyed by the saints reigning with Christ may well be described as a resurrection: for they were once "dead by reason of sins," and have been raised (Jno. 5^{24}, Eph. $2^{5, 6}$) by the voice of Christ into new life. And, in contrast to the resurrection "at the last day," it is "the first resurrection." They who experience it are "blessed and holy:" for to them the resurrection of the body will be a "resurrection of life," and they will thus escape "the second death."

The PLACE in which the saints will reign with Christ is not mentioned. Nothing is said about their reigning "on the earth:" and the statement in Rev. 5^{10} has no reference to the millennium. Of their bodily return to the earth there is, in ch. 20^4, no hint.

515. "When the 1000 years are completed, SATAN will be LOOSED from his prison, and will go forth and deceive the nations." Then follows a great apostacy, a terrific assault

of the rebels upon the saints, their utter overthrow, and the awful punishment of their leader: Rev. 20^{1-10}. This is at once followed, in *vv.*$^{11-15}$, by the dissolution of nature and the final judgment, evidently a judgment of all men, good and bad, at the close of the present order of things: cp. Dan. 7^{10}, Mt. 25^{31-46}, Jno. $5^{28\ 29}$.

If, as we have just seen, Rev. 20^{11-15} is a description of the final judgment, the APOSTACY in *vv.*$^{8-10}$ is in close harmony with Lk. 17^{26-30}, where Christ compares His coming to the flood; and in still closer agreement with 2 Th. 2^{9-11}, where Paul teaches that Christ's *parousia* will be preceded by a *parousia* of a new and terrible form of evil: see § 496. Cp. "deceive the nations" in Rev. 20^{8} with 2 Th. 2^{9-11}. In other words, the various N.T. writers agree to teach that Christ, at His coming, will find the world in deep sin; and that to many His coming will be sudden destruction.

516. The peculiarity of Rev. 20^{1-6} is that it interposes, between the time of writing and the final apostacy, 1000 years during which Satan is bound, while the martyrs and probably others reign with Christ; and that their life is described as "the first resurrection." This BINDING followed by LIBERATION and renewed activity is an element not found elsewhere in the Bible. It must therefore be interpreted with utmost caution, in the light of whatever in the Bible most nearly approaches it.

The SPLENDID VISIONS of the prophets, *e.g.* Isa. 60, do not help us much: for we have in them no hint of subsequent apostacy, and for the more part their language excludes it. The nearest O.T. parallel is Ezek. 37-39. The vision opens in a VALLEY OF DRY BONES: but at the prophet's voice breath enters into them, and the dead wake up to new life. This is explained to be a prophecy of national revival: and with the revived nation God makes a covenant. Then comes an

onslaught of distant heathen nations led by "Gog, of the land of Magog." From this tremendous attack, Israel is rescued by fire from heaven, and Gog and his multitude suffer complete destruction. Lastly follows a picture of the restored temple and worship and of Israel dwelling safely in its own land. The closeness of the parallel leaves little room for doubt that this prophecy was before the mind of the writer of Rev. 20^{1-10}. Unfortunately the one sheds little light on the other. But, that national revival is depicted as a waking up of dead bones into life, is in full harmony with the spiritual meaning given above to "the first resurrection."

A still closer parallel is found in Jno. 5^{24-29}: see § 508. For we have here TWO distinct RESURRECTIONS, one present and spiritual, the other future and bodily, one partial and the other universal. Similarly, in Eph. $2^{5,6}$, some who had been "dead" by reason of their sins were already made alive and raised to sit with Christ in heavenly places: so Col. 2^{12}, 3^{1}. This contains all that is implied in Rev. $20^{4,6}$. For, certainly, those who have heard "the voice of the Son of God" and have thus "passed out of death into life," whom God has "made alive with" Christ and "made to sit with Him in the heavenly places" have experienced what may be called, in contrast to the final consummation, "the first resurrection:" and over them indisputably "the second death has no authority."

517. Of the binding of Satan for a long but limited time, to be again set free for a short time, I can give NO EXPLANATION fully SATISFACTORY. But the binding must be a limitation, by supernatural power, of the activity of the great enemy of God and man: and it follows the final overthrow of other hostile powers. We have no indication that it will take place visibly before the eyes of men; or that it will interfere with the ordinary course of nature, as will the

judgment in Rev. 20^{11}. Still less have we proof that the binding of Satan will banish evil from the earth. Had this been so, for so long a time, he would not, on his return, have so quickly roused the nations to rebellion. The passage is most easily explained as announcing that the earlier victories of the Gospel will be followed by a removal, through an extraordinary manifestation of divine power, of the hindrances which the god of this world has been permitted to put in the way of its further progress.

The above is all that is demanded and justified by Rev. 20^{1-10}: and it permits us to understand in its plain grammatical meaning the abundant and harmonious teaching of the rest of the New Testament. To some, it will seem to fall below the full meaning of the strong words now before us. But to these words we cannot give a stronger meaning without violence to much more abundant and plain teaching elsewhere.

518. If this exposition be correct, we may look upon the PROGRESS of the GOSPEL during the Christian centuries as a victorious war carried on by Christ against the powers of evil which resist the advance of His Kingdom; and may expect still further progress. We may expect that the great forces which still oppose the work of God will be broken, and that the power of evil will be conspicuously limited for a long period. During this time of peace and progress on earth, they who in loyalty to Christ have laid down their lives and all the faithful dead are reigning with Christ within the veil. Strange to say, this long period of peace will be followed, in the mysterious purpose or permission of God, by a loosing of evil powers, for a long time bound; and by consequent revolt. But this uprising of evil will be short. The supernatural power which has already given to the Gospel its earlier victories will be again still more

conspicuously put forth; and the power of evil will be broken for ever. Then follows the great assize, the punishment of the wicked, and the New Earth and Heaven in which the saved will dwell with Christ.

For an objection to the above exposition, serious but not decisive, see § 486.

Thus the Bk. of Revelation accepts to the full the harmonious teaching of the rest of the N.T.; and adds to it an important element, difficult to fit in with it, touching the progress of the Kingdom of Christ before His return to judge the world.

CHAPTER LVIII

MILLENNARIANISM

519. THE foregoing exposition IDENTIFIES Rev. $20^{11\text{-}15}$ with Mt. $25^{31\text{-}46}$, Jno. 5^{28f}, 1 Cor. 15^{52}, 1 Th. 4^{16}, etc. Some good men, commonly known as Millennarians, identify the coming of Christ for which the early Christians were waiting with Rev. 19^{11}. The question thus raised must be answered by comparing these two visions and the events following them with the harmonious teaching of the rest of the New Testament.

In Rev. $20^{11\text{-}15}$, as in Mt. $25^{31\text{-}46}$, Christ sits upon a "throne," and all men stand before Him and are judged by Him according to their works: so Jno. 5^{28f}, where at His bidding all the dead leave their graves, and go forth to "life" or "judgment," as they have done things good or bad: also 2 Th. $1^{6\text{-}10}$, where we read of relief for His servants and

eternal destruction for the disobedient. This close similarity is a strong presumption that these four passages refer to the same event. But nowhere else is Christ's second coming represented as that of a soldier armed for fight; nor is the destruction which follows His coming represented as a military overthrow. He comes, not as a soldier for a fight, but as a judge supported by irresistible power. The SUDDENNESS depicted in Rev. 20^{11} is in complete harmony with 1 Cor. 15^{52}, Mt. $24^{27, 43}$, 1 Th. 5^{4}. But suddenness is quite alien to the picture in Rev. 19^{11-21} of a hero going forth to fight followed by an army, of a summons to the birds to come and eat the bodies of those who will be slain, and of hostile armies prepared for war.

520. The above powerful argument is confirmed by INSUPERABLE DIFFICULTIES involved in the supposition that the coming of Christ will be followed by the Millennium and the apostacy described in Rev. 20^{1-9}. We must conceive the world going on its usual course, and evil in great power. In a moment, a voice from heaven is heard, and Christ appears. At that voice, and to meet their appearing Lord, His murdered servants and others equally faithful wake up from the sleep of death: and with them (1 Cor. 15^{52}, 1 Th. 4^{16}) the righteous then living will be changed and caught up to meet Christ. What about the living children of living believers? Infants, we may suppose, will be caught up with their parents. Of those in their teens, there will surely be a selection, the good taken while the bad are left behind along with those who have no part in the first resurrection. What of the wicked? Are we to suppose that they will continue on earth, eating and drinking, marrying and being given in marriage, in successive generations? And what will be the moral state of mankind when the salt of the earth and the light of the world are removed. Surely

the Millennium will be a pandemonium. The prince of darkness has been bound; but unfortunately there are no servants of Christ left on earth to preach to the wicked a Gospel of repentance. And, of any turning to God, we have no hint in Rev. 20^{1-6}, the only passage in the whole Bible which speaks about the Millennium.

521. Let us now try to follow the RISEN SERVANTS OF CHRIST. Their bodily resurrection (1 Cor. $15^{23, 35, 44}$) implies a definite place. Where are they? Not on earth, which is still occupied by the unsaved: for we cannot conceive, mingled together on the same planet, some who have yet to die and others who have passed through death and will die no more. Such confusion of the present age with the age to come is inconceivable. If not on earth, are they somewhere between earth and heaven, visible to the wicked still on earth? This would so completely change the conditions of human probation as to make its continuance utterly incomprehensible. Or, will the risen ones and the changed survivors suddenly vanish from earth, as the ascending body of Christ vanished from His disciples' view? If so, the coming of Christ would be a voice and appearance of Christ from heaven, heard and seen (Rev. 1^{7}) by all men, followed by the disappearance of Him and of all the good people then living on earth: a suggestion contradicting the whole tenor of N.T. teaching.

After a thousand years, hidden from us in complete obscurity, SATAN RETURNS. He is welcomed by a host as many "as the sand of the sea," who follow him to war against the people of God. This quick and great apostacy proves that the Millennium is no universal reign of righteousness, or a visible reign of Christ on earth. For we cannot conceive such reign followed by revolt in His visible presence; nor that at the release of Satan Christ will retreat, even for

a short time, from the realm over which He had reigned so long.

522. Other insuperable objections beset the theory before us. At Christ's return, the SUN AND MOON will CEASE TO SHINE, and the stars will fall from heaven. A still more graphic picture of this dissolution of nature is given in Rev. $6^{12\text{-}17}$, as heralding the great day of God's anger: so also ch. 20^{11}. These last words, it is impossible to separate from *vv.*$^{1\text{-}10}$: and, if so, they describe a dissolution of nature following the Millennium. But in Mt. 24^{29} a similar dissolution accompanies Christ's second coming. If then this coming precede the Millennium, there will be two dissolutions of nature, separated by more than a thousand years; and, between these catastrophes, a tremendous assault by a great multitude of Satan's followers against the servants of God.

Again, "when the Son of Man comes" He will "separate the SHEEP from the GOATS: Mt. $25^{31\text{f}}$. Indisputably this refers to the one definite coming of which He spoke so much. If then His return is to be followed by the Millennium, we must suppose that after this solemn separation the goats will again break in upon the sheep with the terrible assault depicted in Rev. 20^{9} as following the Millennium. This is inconceivable. Again, Jno. $5^{28\text{f}}$, Rev. $20^{13\text{-}15}$ alike suggest irresistibly one universal resurrection and judgment of good and bad. The theory before us requires us to believe that, in addition to the spiritual resurrection in Jno. 5^{25}, Eph. 2^{6}, there will be, within "an hour," two bodily resurrections separated by more than a thousand years, one of the righteous only, the other of righteous and wicked.

Once more. In Jno. $6^{39,\ 40,\ 44,\ 54}$, Christ announces that He will raise His people "on the LAST DAY:" so ch. 11^{24}

It is utterly incongruous to include in the last day events so dissimilar as the resurrection of the righteous, the 1000 years' bondage of Satan, his release, the assault of Gog and Magog and its overthrow, and the final judgment. Similarly, in 1 Cor. 15^{52}, Paul speaks of the voice which will awaken the dead servants of Christ as "the *last* trumpet." Now, if the righteous are to be raised before the Millennium and the wicked after it, there will be two bodily resurrections; and since the wicked are to be summoned to judgment by the voice of Christ, this voice must be "the last trumpet," and the voice which will summon the righteous will be, not "the last," but perhaps the last but one.

523. Such are the many INSUPERABLE DIFFICULTIES surrounding the theory of a pre-millennial advent of Christ. It breaks up the one definite coming for which His disciples were waiting into two comings separated by a thousand years, each heralded by a trumpet voice and followed by a resurrection of the dead and a dissolution of nature. The period between these two comings and trumpets and resurrections is left in inextricable confusion, and concludes with a tremendous assault of the evil against the good.

524. We now ask, What evidence can be set against these insuperable objections? No direct EVIDENCE. For, throughout the N.T., we find no hint of two bodily comings of Christ or of two bodily resurrections, or of two dissolutions of nature. The one serious objection to the exposition advocated by me is that throughout the N.T., outside Rev. $20^{1\text{-}10}$, we have no hint of long spiritual prosperity preceding Christ's return; and that such long prosperity would be inconsistent with the hope of an early return cherished by some of His early followers. The absence of any trace of the Millennium between Mt. $24^{21\text{-}28}$ and $^{29\text{-}31}$ is remarkable. Still more so is the absence of any reference to it in

2 Th. 2^{1-12}, where Paul warns his readers that the day of Christ is not at hand. So also are other indications in Mt. 16^{28}, etc., of an early return of Christ.

525. To this objection, I have NO COMPLETE ANSWER. But it rests only on ten verses of the most difficult book in the Bible. Our only safe way is to interpret this one passage in the light of the harmonious teaching of the rest of the N.T.; or, if we cannot do this, to suspend our judgment rather than, in deference to these ten verses, to throw into confusion the meaning of the rest of the Bible. Moreover, we have found (§ 514) another interpretation of them which is suggested by the plain meaning of the words used and involves no such confusion.

Indisputably, many passages in the Bk. of Revelation depict events in the spirit world, apart from any visible disturbance of external nature. So ch. 6^{1-11}; whereas *vv.*$^{12-17}$ break through the veil and describe, in such symbolic form as men can understand, events which will visibly set aside the ordinary course of nature. A similar interpretation of ch. 20^{1-6} as referring to spiritual events which do not disturb visibly the course of nature, and of *vv.*$^{11-15}$ as referring to the final catastrophe already depicted in ch. 6^{12-17}, will bring Rev. 20^{1-6} into harmony with the rest of the New Testament. Surely this is an easier solution than that which I here combat.

526. This theory owes its acceptance by some earnest men to a natural rebound from another doctrine still FURTHER REMOVED from N.T. teaching, yet prevalent in some circles of religious activity. By many modern Christians, the second coming of Christ, so conspicuous in the N.T., has been practically ignored. An idea has silently grown up that the departed servants of Christ go AT DEATH TO THEIR FULL REWARD; and that the Gospel will make progress till, by

its instrumentality, all human hearts are brought to bow to Christ. This leaves no place for His bodily return to earth. For His dead servants have attained their consummation; and the whole purpose of God will be accomplished in the ordinary course of the Gospel. To those who hold this view, the second coming of Christ has no real significance. Against this oversight of so large an element of N.T. teaching, Millennarianism is an extreme revolt. And many sympathize with the revolt because they know enough of the N.T. to condemn this loose popular teaching. Unfortunately, by accepting a theory which breaks down under the weight of its own absurdity, they do something indirectly to strengthen the belief which they reject. Our only safeguard is to go back to the teaching of the Bible; and this I have tried to expound.

527. This loose popular teaching has some important ELEMENTS OF TRUTH overlooked by the Millennarians. The N.T. does not teach clearly the conversion of the world by the Gospel. But Christ bade His disciples preach it to all nations: Mt. 24^{4}, 28^{19}, Mk. 16^{15}, Acts 1^{8}. In 2 Th. 3^{1}, Paul begs his readers to pray that the Gospel "may run and be glorified." He announces in Rom. 11^{25f} that all Israel will be saved along with the fulness of the Gentiles. On the meaning of all this, the history of the Christian centuries has shed welcome light. The leaven hidden in the meal has slowly and silently changed the whole: Mt. 13^{33}. And further progress is clearly in view, even during the present order of things. For this further progress the servants of Christ are toiling, and must continue so to do, with all resources at their disposal, assured that their toil will not be in vain. But the clear and abundant teaching of the N.T. warns us that beyond this further progress, in the foresight of God, is the great and final apostacy and

revolt, and that this will be put down, not by the ordinary means which have led forward the Kingdom of God to its present position, but by a supernatural appearance of Christ.

Such earlier prophecies as those in Isa. 11^{9}, 66^{22-24} must be interpreted as referring to the final glory: for after such blessing we cannot conceive another apostacy. They are a very uncertain support for the theory of the conversion of the whole world by the preaching of the Gospel.

528. Most Millennarians expect Christ's EARLY RETURN, almost at any hour. But, whatever we think about the Millennium, Paul's warning, in 2 Th. 2^{3-12}, that Christ will not come till first have come a new and terrible form of evil, is still valid. This did not destroy his hope that possibly he might himself survive His appearance. For so rapid had been the course of events in his own day that a single lifetime might seem sufficient for the appearance of the Man of Sin, and for his destruction by the visible return of Christ. Such rapid development, we CANNOT EXPECT NOW. During eighteen centuries no new form of evil has appeared which can for a moment be identified with the great enemy about whom Paul wrote: and the analogy of these centuries makes his sudden appearance now most unlikely. Moreover, this age and those preceding it have been times of spiritual progress: and the spiritual forces now at work for good show no marks of exhaustion. We cannot expect that this progress, wrought by God through ordinary agencies, will be interrupted by the hand of God. The time of Christ's return must be one of stagnation and retrogression. Consequently, assured as we are that a moment will come when unexpectedly Christ will lay His hand on the wheels of time and stop them for ever, and sweep away the platform on which they have revolved

so long, and build upon its ruins a New Earth and Heaven, we cannot expect this longed-for consummation in our own lifetime. Weary as we are with happy toil, we cannot doubt that we shall lay us down for our last sleep in His arms till the trumpet shall sound and we shall wake up before the open gates of the City of God.

CHAPTER LIX

THE SPIRITUAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE SECOND COMING OF CHRIST

529. THE close agreement of the various and very different N.T. writers is complete proof that Christ left in the minds of His immediate followers a FIRM CONVICTION that in visible form He will return from heaven to earth to close the present order of things, to raise the dead, to judge all men, and to bring in the everlasting glory. It is in the last degree unlikely that in this important matter all His early followers, the men who won for Him the homage of all future ages, were in SERIOUS ERROR about His teaching. This unlikeliness compels us to believe that their unanimous conviction was a correct re-echo of His teaching.

On the other hand, that the doctrine we have traced to Christ pertains to the FUTURE, demands, in our interpretation of it, utmost CAUTION. Doubtless the fulfilment of these N.T. prophecies will differ as greatly from their letter as did that of the O.T. prophecies from the expectation of Israel. But, as then, the realisation must surpass the letter of the promise. And we may expect such fulfilment as might be

most suitably foretold in the form found in the Sacred Records.

530. We now ask, What bearing has the return of Christ on the spiritual life of OUR OWN DAY? It cannot fill, in our thought, the place it had in the minds of Christ's immediate followers. Indeed, it does not hold in Paul's later letters the place it had in his two earliest; nor in the Fourth Gospel the place it had in the First. It cannot be placed on a level, as a fundamental doctrine of the Gospel, with the superhuman dignity of Christ, His resurrection, the pardon of sins through His death and through faith, and the gift of the Holy Spirit to be in us the inward source of a new life.

531. Touching the reality underlying the teaching of Christ about His second coming, we may learn something from 2 Th. 1^7, 1 Cor. 1^7, where it is described as "the REVELATION (or *unveiling*) of the Lord Jesus." The *veil* which now hides from mortal view the eternal realities will in that day be raised or rent. We have here a definite conception of the coming of Christ. It will be a bursting in, upon the visible universe, of the great Invisible beyond and above it, that the Invisible may transform and glorify the visible. This expectation implies, and is the strongest conceivable expression of, a conviction that beyond and above the visible universe is a greater world unseen. Upon this conviction rests the Christian hope and all religious life.

On every side we see a universe of apparently unlimited extent: and it seems to be as DURABLE as it is broad and firm. Indeed, the planets in their orbits and the so-called fixed stars seem to be a visible embodiment of eternity itself. In contrast to the solid earth and the unchanging stars, we seem to be butterflies of a summer or like leaves of the forest opening in the springtime only to pass away in the decay of autumn.

To assert that an hour will strike in which the visible universe, whose age reaches back through unnumbered millenniums, will pass away, is to assert the existence of something greater and older and MORE DURABLE than the solid earth on which so many generations have lived and died ; and of forces or a Power controlling the natural forces which seem to control irresistibly all human life. Thus the doctrine before us is the strongest possible contradiction to the Materialism which asserts that the things which are seen and the forces observed operating in them are the only matters certainly known to man.

532. That the visible universe will not abide for ever, has in our day received remarkable confirmation. All modern research teaches that it is tending towards a state in which LIFE will be IMPOSSIBLE, that natural forces are carrying it irresistibly forward to the silence of death. In this, as in other respects, the life of an individual is an epitome of the life of the race and the world.

Beyond that silence, Natural Science can see nothing. Herbert Spencer timidly suggests (*First Principles* pp. 529-537) that possibly the forces which are destroying the universe will, by some reverse action, bring it back to life. But, for this suggestion, he has no proof or presumption to bring. It is a baseless hope suggested as a disguise to hide the eternal night which is all that Natural Science can foretell.

533. CHRIST also TAUGHT that, just as the present universe has its source in an Unseen greater than itself, so it will be succeeded by another world far greater than that around us, and destined to abide for ever. He taught that this solid earth is but a temporary platform for the passing drama of man's probation, and that when the drama is over the platform will be swept away, to give place to the abiding reality for which that drama is the preparation. This is the

only explanation of the present universe, apparently so durable yet manifestly doomed to pass away; and of human life upon it, apparently so transitory and yet of so much greater stability and value than its material environment. In no other form could these great truths have been so clearly and forcefully stated as in the teaching we have traced to the lips of the Great Teacher who has remoulded for good the thought and life of man.

534. The return of Christ will be a complete and abiding victory and dominion of MIND over MATTER. In this life, matter fetters mind in a thousand ways. The necessities of bodily life compel us to spend time in more or less degrading toil: physical causes produce pain, and thus hinder mental development: and death cuts short our work. Now, Paul teaches (1 Cor. $15^{35, 44}$) that the risen servants of Christ will have BODIES. This implies that the contrast of spirit and body, which is real even though we cannot define it, and is co-extensive with animal life on earth, will have its place in the final consummation. But, whereas their present bodies are *psychical* or *animal* (see § 604), *i.e.* under the laws of animal life, their risen bodies will be *spiritual*, *i.e.* controlled only by the *spirit* within. At present, the nobler element is fettered, and in large measure controlled, by the lower. But this inversion is only transitory and preparatory: in the great consummation, that which is essentially higher will rule and that which is lower will receive its highest possible dignity by becoming the obedient organ of that which is higher than itself: 1 Cor. 15^{44-46}.

Still more conspicuously will the return of Christ be the absolute and eternal victory of GOOD over EVIL. Not unfrequently now evil seems to trample underfoot the good. The wicked flourish, and for a long time: the righteous sometimes lose life itself because they are good and others

around are bad. But the majesty of the inborn moral sense, which speaks with an authority none can gainsay, assures us that the triumph cannot last. Indeed, the moral incongruity of this occasional triumph demands a conspicuous and universally-recognised vindication of Right. All this prepares us for exact retribution. Moreover, so closely interwoven is human action with its material environment, nearer and more remote, and so closely related is the present imperfect retribution to its imperfect environment, that we wonder not that the perfect retribution will have a new and perfect environment, in a New Earth and Heaven.

535. The resurrection of the body will be a full and permanent realisation of the CREATIVE PURPOSE of God. He made man spirit and body, in order that the spirit might rule the body and make it the organ of its self-manifestation, and in order that thus spirit and body might attain their highest well-being. But the body threw off the yoke of the spirit within: and, the original purpose being inverted, both spirit and body sank into discord and bondage. But, that He might restore the order thus disturbed, the Archetype of all created intelligence Himself entered into human flesh and became Man. In those who receive Him, He at once rescues, in some measure, the spirit from bondage to its material environment, nearer and more remote: §§ 307-312. But the rescue is only partial. Christ will come again to redeem even the bodies of His people, and perhaps their further material environment, from the bondage of decay: Rom. 8^{19-23}. He will thus attain the purpose for which man and the universe were created.

This victory cannot be gained by the hand of DEATH. For death is a victory of matter over mind, of evil over good. Lips which spoke for Christ are silent in the grave, in some cases because they spoke so bravely and so well. The

fugitive spirits of His servants have been driven naked from the bodies and the world in which once they served Him. This cannot be for ever. The fugitives must return and claim their own. The world must receive back those whom it once disowned. And all this can be done only by some such dissolution and renovation of nature and resurrection of the dead as Christ taught.

536. The relation between our PRESENT and FUTURE bodies, and between the universe now around us and the new and abiding order of things, is beyond our conception and unimportant. The constant flux in our present bodies does not destroy their continuity. It matters not whether the risen and glorified bodies will, or will not, contain a single particle laid in the grave. The essential point is that the spirits driven forth by death will survive the universe and robe themselves again in material forms. But a wide and deep analogy suggests a real, though to us incomprehensible, continuity or relation between the present battlefield and the scene of the final triumph, and between the bodies once devoted to the service of Christ and those on whose brows will rest the unfading crown.

The hope of a bodily resurrection and of a new earth and heaven gives dignity and worth to MATTER. For it implies that matter, be it what it may, is not a passing but an abiding companion of mind: and this abiding union is suggested irresistibly by the very intimate relation now existing: cp. Ph. 3^{21}.

537. That this victory of mind over matter, of good over evil, and this complete realisation of the creative purpose, are to be brought about by Christ's BODILY RETURN to earth, need not surprise us. For the incarnation of the Creator Son gave to matter a new and infinite dignity. Moreover, in that sacred human body evil achieved its most terrible

victory over good, and matter inflicted on mind its deepest humiliation. In some measure that victory was reversed when Christ rescued from the grave the body which had been the victim of death's triumph. But His victory was incomplete. The Son had entered, in human form, a revolted province in order to bring it back to His sway: and, without having done this, He had returned from a world which had rejected Him. But He took with Him into the Unseen a handful of human dust; and placed it on the throne of heaven. He thus severed that which was designed to be one; and took from the material universe its most highly-honoured part.

Earth claims back that handful of dust; or rather the handful of dust claims the world of which once it was a part. The separation cannot be abiding. He who, driven from earth by man's deepest sin, returned into the body once nailed to the cross, will again return, bringing back the handful of dust from heaven to earth, that its touch may raise earth to heaven.

538. Since the dead servants of Christ were on earth, and now are in His nearer presence, vitally united to Him, we wonder not that their departed spirits will ACCOMPANY their RETURNING LORD. Since they were created body and spirit, we wonder not that they, like their Lord ages ago, will robe themselves again in material forms. And since, both as Creator and Redeemer, Christ claims the homage and obedience of all His rational creatures, we wonder not that at His return He will sit in judgment on all men living and dead.

Thus, in Christ and by His return from heaven to earth, will be accomplished fully the purpose for which the world and man were created. Its orderly accomplishment was disturbed by sin: and this disturbance could be removed only by the suffering and death of the incarnate Son, Himself the Agent of creation. A pledge of its accomplishment was given in

the resurrection, ascension, and enthronement of the Crucified. His return to earth will bring the full realisation of the entire purpose of God.

539. For THAT DAY we wait. Not the death of the body, which is a penalty of sin and a victory of the powers of darkness, but the return of Christ in bodily form to reign over His faithful ones, their own bodies rescued from the grave, is the goal of their exultant hope. The eager hope of His earliest followers suggested that perhaps they might hear His voice and see His face without passing under the dark shadow of death. That hope was not fulfilled: and we cannot share it. But, long as the time seems, that day will come. Had we watched the creation of matter, and known that long ages must elapse before rational man would stand on the earth, our expectation would have wearied at the long delay. But those long ages rolled by; and for thousands of years our planet has teemed with rational life. So will pass by whatever ages remain before our Lord's return. Many reasons suggest that, though not close at hand, it cannot be very long delayed. Doubtless we shall lay us down for our last sleep. But in our sleep we shall be with Him: and, when the morning dawns, we shall wake up to greet the splendour of the rising Son. YES, I COME QUICKLY. AMEN. COME, LORD JESUS.

CHAPTER LX

THE DOOM OF THE LOST

540. THE scanty O.T. references are quoted in § 481. The opinions of the JEWS before Christ may be learnt from the

Bk. of Enoch as quoted in § 491f. So Sirach 7^{17}: "the punishment of the ungodly is fire and worm." Also Judith 16^{17}: "Woe to the nations that rise up against my race: the Lord Almighty will inflict on them just punishment (ἐκδικήσει) in the day of judgment, to put fire and worms in their flesh; and they will wail, feeling the pain, for an age." So Philo (about B.C. 25—A.D. 50) *On the Cherubim* § 1: "He that has been cast out by God endures the everlasting (ἀίδιον) banishment: for, though it has been given to him who has not yet been completely captured by vice, and has repented, to return to virtue as to his native country from which he went into exile, on the other hand he who has been seized and overcome utterly as by an incurable disease must needs bear immortal calamities for the whole age, flung into the place of the ungodly, that he may endure unmitigated and continuous misfortune." Also Josephus (A.D. 37–101) says, in his *Antiq.* bk. xviii. 1^3, that the Pharisees held that those who have acted viciously in life "are detained in an everlasting (ἀίδιον) prison." So his *Wars* bk. ii. 8^{11}: the Essenes, like the Greeks, "allot to the wicked a dark and wintry cell, full of ceaseless punishments:" τιμωριῶν ἀδιαλείπτων.

The above extracts represent fairly, so far as we can trace, the opinions of thoughtful Jews, when Christ appeared, about the doom of the lost. The reference by Josephus to the Greeks, the familiarity of Philo with Greek literature, the close similarity of the above teaching to that of Plato quoted in § 479, and its absence from Jewish writings until the nation came under the influence of GREEK THOUGHT, leave no room for doubt that it was derived from this source. Doubtless its spread among the Jews was helped by the moral considerations which led so many ancient nations to expect retribution beyond the grave, viz. the imperfection of retribution in the present life, viewed in the light of the inborn

moral sense which commands and forbids with an authority we cannot dispute.

541. In spite of this similarity and apparent derivation, this earlier teaching sheds LITTLE or no LIGHT on that of Christ and the New Testament. Indeed, the latter is much more definite and intelligible than the former. On the other hand, the teaching quoted above from Jewish writers and from Plato proves that, in close harmony with a universal principle, Christ built His higher and saving teaching on a foundation of rudimentary truth ALREADY LAID in the thoughts and hearts of men.

542. PAUL. The word *wrath* (A.V. and R.V.), denoting the *anger* of God or man (cp. Eph. 4^{31}, Rom. 13^{4f}), frequently describes the future penalty of sin: *e.g.* 1 Th. 1^{10}, Rom. $2^{5,8}$, Eph. 5^{6}. From this conception must be carefully removed all thought of VINDICTIVE emotion. In this, the righteous anger of a loving parent is a human pattern of the divine. It is simply God's detestation of, and determination to punish, sin. In 2 Th. 1^{8}, the rendering *vengeance* (A.V. and R.V.) is unfortunate: for it suggests ideas which ought to have no place in a ruler. The Greek word (ἐκδίκησις) denotes only *just* infliction of punishment: cp. Rom. 12^{19}, 13^{4}.

543. In 1 Th. 5^{3}, 2 Th. 1^{9}, the doom of the wicked is said (R.V.) to be DESTRUCTION: ὄλεθρος. So 1 Tim. 6^{9}, where it is joined with a cognate and equivalent word, ἀπώλεια. This last word, rendered *destruction* or *perdition*, is used in the same sense in Rom. 9^{22}, Ph. 1^{28}, 3^{19}, Heb. 10^{39}, Mt. 7^{13}, Jno. 17^{12}, Rev. $17^{8,11}$. So is the cognate verb ἀπόλλυμι, in 2 Th. 2^{10}, Rom. 2^{12}, 14^{15}, 1 Cor. 1^{18}, 8^{11}, 15^{18}, 2 Cor. 2^{15}, 4^{3}, Mt. $10^{28,39}$, 16^{25}, 18^{14}, Mk. 1^{24}, 8^{35}, Lk. 9^{24}, $13^{3,5}$, 17^{33}, Jno. 3^{16}, 6^{39}, 10^{28}, 12^{25}. In the active voice, it is rendered *destroy*, as in Mt. 2^{13}, 10^{28}; or *lose*, as in ch. 16^{25}:

in the middle voice, it is frequently rendered *perish*, as in 1 Cor. 1^{18}, etc. This use of the word, more frequent than all others put together, in all four Gospels and by Paul, proves that it was in the apostolic Churches the usual technical term for the doom of the lost. As such it demands most careful study.

544. The active form ὄλλυμι is common in Homer and the tragic poets in the sense of KILL. So *Iliad* bk. 8^{498}: "I would *destroy* both the ships and all the Achæans." So Æschylus, *Agam.* l. 1456: Helen "*destroyed* many souls before Troy." She caused the death of many Greeks. Cp. *Odyssey* bk. 19^{274}: Ulysses "*lost* his dear companions and hollow ship:" *i.e.* they perished at sea. Also *Iliad* bk. 4^{451}: "the shriek and the shout of men *destroying* and being *destroyed*." The N.T. form ἀπόλλυμι is very common especially in later Greek in the sense of *lose* and *destroy*. So Xenophon, *Hellenics* bk. vii. 4^{13}: "Many men and many weapons they *lost*, retreating through a rough country."

The frequent use of the above words as synonyms of death gives importance to the current GREEK CONCEPTION of the state of the DEAD. In the *Odyssey* bk. 11, we have a visit of Ulysses to the realm of the dead, and his intercourse there with his dead acquaintances. All are conscious, all remember the things of earth, and some describe even the mode of their own death: but their existence is overshadowed by darkness and gloom. Achilles says (ll. 489-91) that the poorest lot on earth is better than that of the highest among the dead. Such wretchedness may well be called *destruction*: for the dead have *lost* everything worth having. Plato (see § 479) describes the dead as still conscious.

In later Greek, the same words denote RUIN of any kind. So Dio Chrysostom speaks (Or. 31, p. 348*c*) of very immoral men as "those to the last degree *ruined*." So Plutarch

(*On the Love of Riches* § 7) says of misers, "the children they think to educate they *ruin* and pervert, planting in them their own love of money:" also (*Mark Antony* ch. 66) of Cleopatra, as "the woman who had already *ruined* him and *would-yet-more-ruin* him." In the *Odyssey* bk. $10^{237\text{-}240}$, Circé turns men into swine, leaving their minds unchanged: and this is in l. 250 called *destruction*.

Plato frequently uses the middle voice of the same word in the sense of ceasing to be, of complete dissipation: but, in so doing, he is careful to define his meaning. So *Phædo* p. 70*a*: "In what relates to the soul, men are apt to be incredulous; they fear that when she leaves the body she may be no longer anywhere, but that on the very day on which the man dies she may perish and *be-destroyed* (διαφθείρηται τε καὶ ἀπολλύηται), immediately on her release from the body issuing forth dissolved like smoke or air, and in her flight vanishing away into nothingness." So. p. 91*d*: "the soul herself *be-destroyed*, and this be death, *destruction* (ὄλεθρος) of the soul."

545. With this classical use of the word, that in the N.T. is in complete agreement. So Mt. 2^{13}, Mk. 3^{6}, Lk. 11^{51}, 13^{33}. Also Mt. 8^{25}, 9^{17}: for the disciples seemed to be sinking into the jaws of death, and the wineskins were so damaged as to be useless. In Lk. $15^{4.\,8}$, neither *lost* sheep nor coin was injured: for they were afterwards *found*, to the joy of their owners. But, from the temporary point of view of these last, the destruction was complete. Another contrast is the word *save*: so Mt. 16^{25}, Lk. 9^{24}. In *v.*^{25} Christ suggests that a man may "*lose* himself." Note in Lk. 11^{51} and Jno. 10^{28} an apparent contradiction: in one sense the martyrs *perished*: in another, they will "never *perish*." A good example of the word is 2 Pet. 3^{6}: for at the flood the world was not annihilated but for a time utterly *ruined*. So Mt.

26^{8}: "to what end this *destruction*?" For the poured-out perfume was incapable of further use.

546. The meaning of the word is now clear. It does not denote ANNIHILATION: for the lost may be found, whereas annihilation involves a breach of continuity which excludes subsequent restoration. But annihilation would be a conspicuous form of destruction. In spite of the various renderings we are compelled to adopt, the word conveys always the same root idea, viz. utter and hopeless RUIN, the complete failure of the maker's or owner's purpose; whether the ruined object ceases to exist, or continues a worthless existence. But sometimes, *e.g.* of the *lost* coin, this ruin is looked at not objectively, as it is in itself, but only from the speaker's own subjective and limited point of view; its use for him is at an end.

547. This common and intelligible Greek word is in the N.T. the most frequent description of the doom of the lost. So used, it cannot denote, as the word itself often denotes, BODILY DEATH: for this is the lot of all men alike, and therefore cannot be the punishment of sin. It can be no less than a supernatural infliction of UTTER AND HOPELESS RUIN beyond the grave. The word means neither extinction of consciousness nor endless torment, but simply the loss of all that gives worth to existence. Yet either extinction or endless torment might properly be called *destruction*: for each would be utter ruin. In Mt. 10^{6}, 15^{24}, this destruction is spoken of as already inflicted: for the "*lost* sheep" had strayed so far that they could not possibly save themselves from utter ruin. But (Lk. 19^{10}) the Son of Man came to seek and save the *lost*. On the other hand, in 2 Th. 2^{10}, 2 Cor. 4^{3}, 1 Cor. 1^{18}, 2 Cor. 2^{15}, the present participles (*being-lost* and *being-saved*) represent salvation and destruction as processes now going on. They who are in "the way leading to life"

experience day by day the operation of a power which is bearing them safely to endless rest; whereas they who tread "the way leading to *destruction*" are day by day sinking into utter ruin. With equal appropriateness, from other points of view, Paul speaks of one class in Eph. 2^5 as already "saved;" and says of the same, in Rom. $5^{9,10}$, that they "will be saved," and in ch. 13^{11} that their salvation is now nearer than when they believed. Similarly in 1 Th. 5^3, 2 Th. 1^9 we read of *destruction* to be inflicted at the coming of Christ; and in Mt. 10^{28} of "Him who is able to destroy soul and body in Gehenna." For only in the great day will the destruction which has already begun and is daily making progress receive its full consummation.

548. The destruction awaiting the lost is in 2 Th. 1^9 further described as ETERNAL: *αἰώνιον*.

On the word *αἰών*, see Aristotle, *On Heaven* bk. 1^9: "the limit (*τὸ τέλος*) which embraces the time of each one's life, outside of which there is nothing by nature, is called each one's *αἰών*. In the same way, the limit of the whole heaven, and the limit embracing the whole time and infinity, is *αἰών*, taking its name from *ἀεὶ εἶναι*." This double use is found in all Greek literature. The word means primarily a man's LIFETIME; and then the longer duration of the order of things around. But in all cases the idea of time is conspicuous.

In the LXX., this Greek word is almost always a rendering of a Hebrew word of similar meaning. In Ex. 21^6, Dt. 15^{17}, *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*, or "for ever," means *for life*. In Gen 6^4, Isa. 63^9, Amos 9^{11}, Mic. 7^{14}, the word *αἰών* denotes a long period whose beginning is lost in the distant past. In Isa. 32^{14} we read, "the hill and the watchtower shall be dens for ever: " *ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος*. But, that this does not refer to endless desolation, we learn from the words following: "until the Spirit be poured upon us from on high, and the wilderness

become a fruitful field, and the fruitful field be counted for a forest." But, though not endless, the desolation was *age-lasting*. Referring to past time, the same word is used in Jno. 9^{32}, Acts 3^{21}, 15^{18}. Similarly 1 Cor. 2^{7}, Eph. $3^{9,11}$, Col. 1^{26}.

549. The corresponding ADJECTIVE αἰώνιος has the same variety of meaning, viz. *lifelong*, or *agelasting*, of time past or future. In classical Greek it is very rare; but in the LXX. it is found some 140 times as an alternative rendering of the same Hebrew word: cp. Isa. $63^{9,11}$. To this last, therefore, we must look for its N.T. meaning. In Job 41^{4}, God asks, touching leviathan, "will he make a covenant with thee? wilt thou take him as an *eternal* slave?" recalling Ex. 21^{6}, Dt. 15^{17}. Referring to a far-distant past, we find in Ps. 77^{5} mention of "*eternal* years" gone by, in Ps. $24^{7,9}$ we have twice "*eternal* gates," R.V. margin *ancient*; and in Isa. 58^{12}, 61^{4} "*eternal* ruins."

Very important is its use (42 times) in the Pentateuch. In Gen. 21^{33} we have the "*eternal* God," and in Ex. 3^{15} His "*eternal* name." Elsewhere it refers to the future, denoting always a long time, *e.g.* in Gen. $9^{12,16}$ for the rainbow, in chs. $17^{7,8,13}$, 48^{4}, for circumcision and the possession of Canaan; and in Ex. $12^{14,17,24}$, 27^{21}, 28^{43}, 30^{21}, Lev. 6^{22}, 10^{9}, 16^{29}, 17^{7}, $23^{14,21,31,41}$, 24^{3}, Num. 10^{8}, 15^{15}, 18^{23}, 19^{10}, we read of "*eternal* statutes," *e.g.* about the passover, oil for the sacred lamp, Aaron's vestments, and other details of the Mosaic ritual. Thus a word counted fit to describe twice the endless existence of God is used also very frequently to describe Israel's possession of Canaan, which has long been in other hands, and the ordinances of the tabernacle, which have been finally superseded by the realities therein symbolized. This warns us that the word *eternal*, though denoting always long duration, does not in itself imply endless

permanence. Indeed, even when used of God, it has not this meaning, any more than the word *mighty* when applied to God, *e.g.* Jer. 32^{18}, is equivalent to *almighty*. The same word is appropriately used in the same sense both of God and (*e.g.* ch. 9^{23}) of men.

550. In Rom. 16^{25}, 2 Tim. 1^{9}, Tit. 1^{2}, we read of "times *eternal*" during which the Gospel mystery was kept in silence, and "before" which grace and a promise of "life *eternal*" were given. This promise must have been made in time, not in eternity: and this is confirmed by the plural form *times*, which could not denote endless duration. Yet the same word in the same verse correctly describes these historic ages gone by and the future *life* of the righteous: for both were *age-lasting*: cp. Rom. $16^{25, 26}$. And this is all that the word *eternal* means. In Jude [7] Sodom and Gomorrah are described as "undergoing punishment of *eternal* fire." These words cannot denote a flame burning endlessly and causing endless torture. For the cities are said to "lie before us as an example," which suffering in the unseen world could not be to men on earth. They depict the LONG AGES during which the cities of the plain, destroyed by fire, had lain conspicuously desolate. The "*eternal* fire" denotes here, not endless flame causing endless torment, but agelasting desolation caused by a flame which had long ago burnt itself out. Conversely, in Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho* ch. 81, the words "*eternal* resurrection" describe, not an endless rising, but an agelasting result of the rising.

Elsewhere in the N.T. the word *eternal* refers to future blessing. We have "*eternal* life" in Rom. 2^{7}, 5^{21}, $6^{22, 23}$, Gal. 6^{8}, 1 Tim. 1^{16}, 6^{12}, Tit. 1^{2}, 3^{7}, etc. Cp. 2 Cor. 4^{17}, 5^{1}, 2 Tim. 2^{10}, etc. Wherever used, both substantive and adjective, αἰών and αἰώνιος, denote long duration, the length to be determined by the context.

That the word *eternal* is not equivalent to ENDLESS is proved by the quotation from Irenæus quoted in § 561. For, if equivalent, the second word would be empty tautology. The word *eternal* is taken from Mt. 25^{46}: the word *endless* is added to remind us that "the good things from God" are both "*eternal* and *endless*."

551. In 2 Th. 1^{9}, in a passage describing the doom of the lost, we read that they "will pay penalty, viz. ETERNAL DESTRUCTION." The adjective *eternal*, now added to the word *destruction* already used in 1 Th. 5^{3}, suggests irresistibly that, of the ruin here foretold, the writer foresaw no end. On the other hand, these words make no assertion about the condition of the *lost*, *i.e.* whether they will continue in a worthless and wretched consciousness, or sink into unconsciousness. For the word *destruction* does not, in itself, denote extinction, but only the loss of all that gives worth to existence: see § 546. Nor can we infer, from this use of the adjective *eternal* or *agelasting*, that the persons destroyed are themselves agelasting. For it describes, not the persons destroyed, but the destruction awaiting them. This last will be agelasting, even if the lost ones sink into unconsciousness. For its results will continue throughout the ages during which, but for their sin and rejection of salvation, they would have enjoyed infinite blessing in the presence of God. Consequently, these words make no assertion about the lost except that, of their ruin, the writer sees no end.

552. Other passages add to the gloom which surrounds the solemn matter before us. In Ph. 3^{19}, touching certain "enemies of the cross," we read that their "END is destruction;" similarly, of certain ministers of Satan, in 2 Cor. 11^{15} that their "*end* shall be according to their works," evidently a bad end: cp. Heb. 6^{8}, 1 Pet. 4^{17}.

The word τέλος or *end* denotes the attainment of a goal,

the full outworking of all inherent tendencies. This gives great force to Rom. $6^{21.\ 22}$, "the *end* (*i.e.* full outworking) of those things is death." But this fuller meaning includes always the idea of finality: and sometimes this last idea is so conspicuous that the word means little more than cessation. So Lk. 1^{33}, Mk. 3^{26}; where the context implies that that which has completed its course has also passed away. But, so far as I have noticed, the word never leaves room for subsequent reversal.

Paul writes with tears, "whose *end* is *destruction*." But if for the ruined ones there were final restoration, even after long ages, these ages of darkness would roll by, and give place to sunshine and life. That sunshine would know no sunset or cloud: and, as age succeeds age of increasing glory, the ages of darkness would dwindle into a dim and fading memory of a retreating past. Of such happy spirits, none could say that their *end* was *destruction*, or was "according to their" bad "works." To them destruction would be, not an end, but a dark pathway into eternal light. The *end* of all men would be the same, viz. eternal life. In other words, if Paul had had any idea that all men will at last be saved, he could not have written these words. See further in §§ 557, 562. This compels us to believe that he looked upon the destruction of the lost as final.

553. In Gal. 6^{8}, 1 Cor. 3^{17}, the doom of the lost is described as CORRUPTION (*φθορά*, *φθείρει*): a synonym of destruction, see quotation from Plato in § 544; also 1 Cor. 15^{33}, 2 Cor. 7^{2}, 11^{3}, Eph. 4^{22}, Col. 2^{22}, 1 Tim. 6^{5}, 2 Tim. 3^{8}. In 1 Cor. 9^{25} the word suggests the withering of leaves; in ch. $15^{42.\ 53}$, Acts 13^{36}, the decay of a corpse. This close synonym to the word destruction is additional proof that the fate of the lost presented itself to Paul chiefly as utter ruin, the loss of all that gives distinctive value to humanity. This is further

confirmed in Rom. $6^{21, 23}$, 8^{13}, which suggest the ruin of bodily forms by *death* as analogous to the doom awaiting sinners: cp. Eph. $2^{1, 5}$. As contrasts, the reward of the righteous is *incorruptibility* and *life eternal*: Rom. 2^{7}, 1 Cor. 9^{25}, $15^{42, 50-54}$, 2 Tim. 1^{10}, 1 Pet. 1^{4}; Rom. 2^{7}, 5^{21}, $6^{22, 23}$, Gal. 6^{8}, 1 Tim. 1^{16}, 6^{12}, Tit. 1^{2}, 3^{7}, cp. Acts $13^{46, 48}$.

554. In Rom. 2^{5}, we find an impenitent man *treasuring* for himself anger in the day of judgment. This implies that he is daily increasing the punishment awaiting him. So 2 Cor. 5^{10} implies gradation of reward and punishment. All this implies consciousness continuing beyond the great assize. For annihilation would be alike to all. Consequently the fate of the lost was not, in Paul's view, immediate extinction. If not, it must be intense suffering. For the light of the great day will reveal to them the greatness of the salvation and blessing they have carelessly thrown away, and the infinite love they have shamefully trampled underfoot. Agony more terrible than this retrospect, we cannot conceive. It is an inevitable inference from abundant N.T. teaching that Christ will give back to every one according to his works.

555. Beyond his assertion of their utter ruin, and our inference that of this ruin they will be conscious, Paul teaches nothing about the state of the lost. He does not assert or suggest that they will ever sink into unconsciousness. For other objects said to be destroyed indisputably continue to exist, and some to think and speak: and we shall see (§ 556) that *life* is more than existence or consciousness, and that therefore loss of life does not necessarily involve loss of conscious existence. On the other hand, Paul does not teach or suggest the endless consciousness of those who will be destroyed: for possibly, in the mercy of Him who gives sleep even to the wicked, their consciousness of ruin may ultimately sink into oblivion. But of this possible relief, he gives no

hint. In this comparative reticence, there is profound solemnity. Before Paul's reluctant eye, looms a vision of ruin. In that dark vision he cannot see a ray of light. He therefore, without attempting to mark out its limits, turns from it to greet the life eternal, the gift of God in Christ.

556. In JOHN 3^{16}, 6^{39}, 10^{28}, 17^{12} the word rendered *destroy*, *perish*, *lose* (see § 543) is used to describe the fate of the lost. So the word *anger* or *wrath* in Jno. 3^{36}; *death* in ch. 5^{24}, cp. 1 Jno. 3^{14}, and *die* in Jno. 8^{24}. In ch. 15^{6}, we have the metaphor of the destruction of vegetable matter by fire: see § 557.

A conspicuous feature of the Gosp. and 1st Ep. of John is the term ETERNAL LIFE (cp. § 550) to describe the lot of the saved: so Jno. $3^{15, 16, 36}$, $4^{14, 36}$, $5^{24, 39}$, $6^{27, 40, 47, 54, 68}$, 10^{28}, $12^{25, 50}$, $17^{2, 3}$; 1 Jno. 1^{2}, 2^{25}, 3^{15}, $5^{11, 13, 20}$. So also Mt. $19^{16, 29}$, 25^{46}, Mk. $10^{17, 30}$, Lk. $18^{18, 30}$, Jude ^{21}. This evidence, from various N.T. writers, leaves no room for doubt that Christ actually described the blessedness of the saved as *life eternal*. The same phrase is found in Dan. 12^{2}; also in Bk. of Enoch chs. 37^{4}, 40^{9}, 58^{3} for the reward of the righteous, and in the Greek fragment of ch. 10^{10}. This is another example of Christ using, in a higher sense, language already current, in later Jewish literature.

From the phrase *eternal life* used to describe the reward of the righteous, some have inferred that others will ultimately sink into unconsciousness. But this inference is most uncertain: for the blessedness of the saved is much more than existence. It is the normal condition of intelligent persons created in order that they may know and love God for ever. This normal life is already lost by sin, even though intelligent consciousness remain. The inference that a worthless existence must necessarily sink ultimately into

unconsciousness is a mere speculation about that of which we know nothing.

So far, except the metaphor of vegetable matter burnt up, in Jno. 15^{6}, Heb. 6^{8}, which confirms strongly the finality of the doom of the lost, we have added nothing to Paul's plain teaching that they will be utterly *ruined*, that this ruin will be their *end*, and that their punishment will be in *proportion* to their sin, this involving *consciousness* of ruin.

CHAPTER LXI

THE DOOM OF THE LOST, CONTINUED

557. Synoptic Gospels. As in Jno. 15^{6}, Heb. 6^{8}, so in Mt. $3^{10, 12}$, Lk. $3^{9, 17}$, and Mt. 7^{19}, $13^{30, 42, 50}$, the fate of the wicked is compared to trees, chaff, and weeds burnt up by fire. The metaphor of FIRE, as a punishment of sin, meets us again in Mt. 5^{22}, $18^{8, 9}$, 25^{41}, Mk. $9^{43, 48}$. On the other hand, in 1 Pet. 1^{7}, 1 Cor. 3^{13} we have gold tested by fire, and fire testing every man's work. But in the above passages the wicked are compared to vegetable matter which is always utterly destroyed, and never benefited, by fire. We have no hint, in the N.T., that the punitive fire is remedial. It suggests irresistibly final destruction.

Does this strong metaphor imply or suggest the EXTINCTION of the lost? Certainly the burning of weeds, etc., comes as near to annihilation as do any natural phenomena. Notice also in Mt. 3^{12}, $13^{30, 40}$, Lk. 3^{17} the strong word κατακαύσει or *burn-up*. If the annihilation of the wicked were as plainly taught elsewhere in the N.T. as is the finality of their

punishment in Ph. 3^{19}, etc., it would, like this last doctrine, be confirmed by the metaphor before us. But such teaching cannot be found. Now, metaphor, unless supported by plain teaching, or at least by other similar metaphor, is a most uncertain basis for doctrine. For all comparison fails somewhere: and when doctrine is built simply on one metaphor, it is impossible to distinguish between the essential teaching, and the mere drapery, of the metaphor. If punishment be final, this is of itself sufficient to justify the use of the metaphor of destruction by fire; and therefore marks the limit of its doctrinal significance. On the other hand, it is the strongest possible confirmation of the plain teaching, expounded in § 552, that the ruin of the lost will be final. For any restoration of burnt-up vegetable matter is inconceivable.

558. In connection with punishment by *fire*, notice the word GEHENNA in Mt. $5^{22, 29, 30}$, 10^{28}, 18^{9}, 23^{33}, Mk. $9^{43, 45, 47}$ with emphatic repetition, Lk. 12^{5}. This conspicuous and repeated reference to a valley close to Jerusalem is explained in Jer. 7^{31}, 19^{4-7}. Whether or not the victims of these idolatrous sacrifices were burnt alive, we do not know. But the metaphor of fire suggests intense suffering like that caused by burning: for it is evidently designed to teach the tremendous punishment awaiting sinners; and the mere burning of a corpse adds nothing to the punishment.

This idea of CONSCIOUS SUFFERING, in connection with the metaphor of fire, is placed beyond doubt, and is thrust into marked prominence, in Mt. $13^{42, 50}$, the exact repetition adding awful significance. The "weeping and gnashing of teeth" reveal the intense pain of those who suffer this fearful punishment. Same words in ch. 8^{12}, 22^{13}, 25^{30}; and in ch. 24^{51}, Lk. 13^{28}. This repetition of the same phrase gives great prominence to the idea of suffering. But in all

these seven passages nothing is said about the endlessness or the end of this severe suffering. The curtain is several times lifted for a moment, revealing a vision of anguish; but we have no indication of its duration.

559. In Mk. $9^{43\text{-}48}$, we have a startling threefold exhortation supported by a threefold and most solemn delineation of the fate of the lost. Christ bids His hearers sacrifice hand or foot or eye rather than "go away into Gehenna." This last word, He at once expounds by the addition, "to the fire unquenchable." In the second warning, we have simply, "cast into Gehenna;" and, in the third, evidently parallel to "the fire unquenchable," the remarkable words, "where their WORM dies not, and the FIRE is not quenched."

This remarkable phrase, found in the N.T. only here, recalls at once Isa. 66^{24}. The prophet sees a new heaven and earth, where from sabbath to sabbath all flesh will come to worship before God. Yet, amid that glory, the glorified ones will go forth and behold the corpses of those who sinned. These corpses proclaim the doom of the spirits which in those bodies once sinned against God. This dark shadow falling so terribly across the bright vision, the writer deepens by adding that "their worm shall not die, and their fire shall not be quenched." These words suggest a continuance of the awful spectacle: for, if there were no corpses to feed on, the worm would die; and, if there were no fuel, the fire would (cp. Mt. 25^{8}) be extinguished. The plain reference in Isa. 66^{22} to the new heaven and earth, when the old things have passed away, proves that the fire and worm are metaphorical: and this is placed beyond doubt by the impossibility of the same corpse being consumed by both fire and worms. Moreover, the trees and chaff and tares are manifestly metaphorical: so must be the fire that destroys them. Consequently, the passages before

us do not in the least degree imply or suggest that the wicked will be punished by material fire. The word *abhorrence* following is the same as in Dan. 12^2. The passages quoted in § 540 suggest that the combined metaphor was not uncommon among the Jews, for the future punishment of sin.

The easiest explanation of Mk. 9^{48} is that these words from Isa. 66^{24} were added to convey the idea of INTENSE SUFFERING, like that caused by fire, or by the gnawing of a worm. But the change of tense from "will not die" to "does not die," etc., suggests continuous suffering in the present rather than endless suffering in the future. This change of tense and the great difficulty of the metaphor forbid us to interpret the passage as an assertion of the endless torment of the lost.

560. In Mt. 5^{25}, we have no indication whether or not the debt will some day be paid and the prison door opened, but only an assertion that till the debt is paid the prison will remain closed. Nor can we infer from ch. 12^{32} that there will be forgiveness in the age to come. But unforgiven sin suggests continuing punishment. In the parallel passage, Mk. 3^{29}, we read of one "guilty of," *i.e.* inwardly held fast by, "an eternal sin:" a clear reference to the abiding result and penalty of a past sin. In Mt. 18^8, 25^{41}, we have "eternal fire," as in Jude [7]: see § 550. The example of Sodom warns us that this phrase does not necessarily imply an agelasting flame, but only an agelasting desolation.

561. In Mt. 25^{46}, "the eternal fire" is further described as "ETERNAL PUNISHMENT," in contrast to "eternal life." The word here used (κόλασις) and its cognate verb are used by classical writers for the pruning of trees, the cutting away of anything superfluous, and the restraining of what would otherwise go beyond bounds; and not unfrequently

in the sense of punishment. Aristotle (*Rhetoric* bk. 1^{10}) distinguishes it from τιμωρέω, used in Acts 22^5, 26^{11}, as "inflicted for the good of him who suffers it, whereas the latter is for the satisfaction of him who inflicts it." But in Euripides, *Helen* 1172 we read of punishment by death (θανάτῳ τοὺς κακοὺς κολάζομεν) which could not be remedial. Same word in Acts 4^{21}: and certainly the idea of moral benefit was very far from the thought of those who were unable to punish the apostles. Elsewhere in N.T. only in 2 Pet. 2^9, 1 Jno. 4^{18}. The two words occur 16 times in the Bk. of Wisdom, 13 times in the Bks. of Maccabees, and in a few other places in the Lxx.: but neither there nor in the N.T. does the context suggest anything beyond the penalty of wrong-doing.

Since in Mt. 5^{22}, etc., (see § 558) the lost are depicted as in acute suffering, many have inferred that this "agelasting punishment," in contrast to "agelasting life," must involve ENDLESS SUFFERING. But punishment is by no means equivalent to suffering. Indeed a child who, instead of going to an entertainment, is put to bed for a fault, and goes to sleep, may be said to be undergoing punishment even while asleep. For, had he not misconducted himself, he would have been awake and in pleasure. The doom of the lost will include, not only actual suffering, but loss of the endless blessedness for which all men were created. Consequently, the punishment will be as lasting as the life which, but for his sin, the sinner would enjoy. For punishment does not cease till the person punished is restored to the position in which he would have been had he not sinned.

This is well put, in reference to Mt. 25^{46}, by Irenæus in bk. v. 27^2: "they who by their apostacy have cast away the things before mentioned, as being deprived of all the good things, experience every kind of punishment, not that

God immediately punishes them but that punishment follows because of their having been deprived of all the good things. Moreover the good things from God are *eternal* and *endless* (αἰώνια και ἀτελεύτητα). And because of this, the deprival of them is *eternal* and *endless*; just as, the light being continuous, they who have blinded themselves or have been blinded by others are continuously deprived of the enjoyment of the light." Similarly, the civil penalty of death is not measured by the pain inflicted but by the loss of life. No one thinks, apart from retribution beyond the grave, that the punishment is over when the criminal is dead. So Augustine, *City of God* bk. 21^{11}: "he who for some great crime is punished with death, do the laws reckon his punishment by the space of time in which he is put to death, which is very brief, and not by this, that he is removed for ever from the society of the living?" *in sempiternum auferunt de societate viventium.* Similarly, whatever becomes of the lost, their punishment continues as long as they are not restored to the favour and life of God. This being so, the precise meaning of the word *eternal* in Mt. 25^{46} is unimportant. For the loss of endless blessing is itself endless punishment.

562. In Mt. 26^{24}, Mk. 14^{21}, we read "it were good for him, if that man had not been born." But if, after ages of suffering Judas were admitted into the endless and infinite blessedness of the saved, this last would be worth having, even at the cost of terrible suffering preceding it. Better to be cast into the lake of fire and then to enter eternal life, than never to have existed. These words could not have been said or written by one who believed that all men will ultimately be saved.

563. The dramatic pictures of the BK. OF REVELATION

are, like the N.T. parables, unless confirmed by plain statement, an unsafe basis for doctrinal inferences.

The word TORMENT (*βάσανος*) is used in 2 Macc. $7^{8, 13, 17}$ for acute and prolonged suffering: so Mt. 4^{24}, 8^{6}, Rev. 9^{5}, 12^{2}. It is a technical Greek term for examination of witnesses by torture. In a diluted metaphorical sense, we find it in Mt. 14^{24}, Mk. 6^{48}, 2 Pet. 2^{8}, Rev. 11^{10}. This word and its cognates are used in Lk. $16^{23, 28}$, Rev. $14^{10, 11}$ (cp. $18^{7, 10, 15}$, 20^{10}, Mt. 18^{34}) to describe the doom of the lost. This implies that their fate includes intense suffering.

564. The strange collocation of words in Rev. 14^{10}, "mixed unmixed" suggests a combination of different elements together with undiluted intensity. To "fire," is added a new element "and sulphur." A visible memento of acute suffering is seen in "the smoke of their torment." Cp. Gen. 19^{28}: but here the word *torment* is not used. Probably when in the morning Abraham looked toward Sodom the agonies of its inhabitants were over: but the smoke told how terrible they had been. In Rev. 14^{11}, the visible proof of the intense suffering of the lost "goes up for ever and ever:" the corrected reading in the R.V. emphasizing its long duration. The words following assert the ceaseless unrest of the sufferers, and specify them.

This passage recalls, and was probably prompted by, Isa. 34^{8-10}; of which the best exposition is the desolation which for ages has rested on the land of EDOM. But this remarkable fulfilment proves that the prophet's language was not literal, but rhetorical: for no such smoke now goes up. Yet the prophecy is none the less fulfilled in the utter and conspicuous desolation of the ancient home of these enemies of Israel: and this awful doom could not, for the moral purposes for which it was given, have been better described than in the prophet's words. But it warns us not to build

accurate statements of doctrine on the pictorial details of unfulfilled prophecy.

In the doom of Edom, actual personal suffering is absent: in Rev. 14^{10f}, it is very conspicuous. This difference warns us not to bring down the meaning of the later prophecy to that of the earlier.

565. Very conspicuous is the doom of BABYLON in Rev. 18. From ch. $17^{9, 18}$ we learn that it refers to ROME, which in the apostles' day was more powerful than Babylon ever was, and twice in the first century was a terrible foe to the Christians. The motive which prompted the prophecies against Edom and Babylon would prompt equally this prophecy against Rome. But its fulfilment differed much more from the literal meaning of the prophet's words than did that of the earlier prophecies. Nothing like the judgment of the great harlot, as here described, has ever taken place or can take place. This warns us again not to build our expectation of the future on the literal meaning of ancient symbolic language.

In Rev. 19^{20} we read "*living* they two (the beast and the false prophet) were cast into the lake of fire burning with sulphur." This describes the overthrow of a power which in *v.*[19] was seen leading "the kings of the earth and their armies" to war against Christ. It recalls Num. 16^{33}, where the men that followed Korah "went down *living* to Sheol," or Hades. Into the same lake of fire and sulphur, after the millennium and the great apostacy, the Devil was cast; so were Death and Hades and everyone not found written in the Book of Life: Rev. $20^{10, 14, 15}$. But these passages add nothing to the previous teaching about the fate of the lost.

566. Beyond the great white throne, the wreck of the present world, and the fearful doom of sinners, appears, in

Rev. 21^{1-7}, in conspicuous contrast to the city which has perished, another City, THE NEW JERUSALEM, as a bride adorned for her husband: and in the splendour of that vision we seem to forget both sin and its punishment. Taken alone, *v.*[4] suggests complete extinction of all evil. But, that this is not so, we soon learn. Across this landscape of undimmed glory creeps, in *v.*[8], a dark shadow. It is only for a moment; and the bright vision returns: *vv.*[9-26]. From a lofty mountain we see again the holy city descending out of heaven from God; and we mark its lofty walls, its vast proportions, its gates of pearl, its streets of gold, its foundations of precious stones, and its splendour making needless the light of the sun. But again, in *v.*[27], a dark shadow is flung across the scene, a shadow the deeper because of the brightness of the light intercepted. Again the shadow vanishes. We see, in ch. 22^{1-5}, the river with its trees of life bearing many fruits and leaves of healing. Curse and night shall be no longer. "They need no light of lamp and light of sun: because the Lord God will give them light. And they shall reign for the ages of the ages."

The vision is over. The angel assures John that "these words are trustworthy and true;" and adds in *v.*[11], "the unrighteous man, let him be unrighteous yet more; and the filthy man, let him be defiled yet more." Surely these words are not addressed to men still living: and, if not, they must describe men contemporaneous with the foregoing visions of glory. This is confirmed in *v.*[15] by another vision of punishment. These deep shadows falling four times across the bright visions which close the Bk. of Revelation are most significant. Touching some bad men in his own day, Paul wrote, in Ph. 3^{19}, "whose end is destruction." This judgment we now see fulfilled. On the utmost verge of the prophet's farthest vision, and outside the glorious City

of God we see ruined men still characterised by the sins they committed on earth.

567. The N.T. teaching on the doom of the lost is now before us. Throughout it, those condemned on the great day are said to be *destroyed* or *lost*, a term denoting utter RUIN. The same word describes the present state of the wicked; and is a common synonym for natural death. This last use makes natural death a symbol of both the present and future state of the unsaved.

This ruin is four times said to be the END of the ungodly: and this is confirmed by casual but solemn words of Christ about the fate of Judas, and by a frequent metaphor in which the fate of the lost is compared to the destruction of vegetable matter by fire. All this proves clearly that the N.T. writers anticipated that some will be finally shut out from the blessing awaiting the righteous. The above metaphor suggests perhaps the dissipation of the consciousness of the lost. But *destruction* does not necessarily involve ANNIHILATION: and, since, in the N.T., life involves much more than existence, the reservation of the word *life*, touching the world to come, to describe the lot of the saved (see § 556) does not prove or suggest that others will eventually cease to be.

About the future state of the lost, except that it will be utter ruin and loss of all that gives worth to existence, nothing is said by Paul or in Gosp. and 1st Ep. of John. But we find there, clearly taught, retribution in proportion to action good or bad. This implies conscious existence: for unconsciousness admits of no degrees. But it does not necessarily imply endless consciousness. In the Synoptic Gospels, the wail of the lost reveals their acute suffering. But nothing is said about its duration, except that the metaphor of an undying worm suggests its continuity. We read twice of

"agelasting fire:" but the use of the phrase elsewhere forbids us to infer from it more than the lasting effect of the fire. We read also of "agelasting punishment:" but permanent injury or loss, inflicted by a judge in consequence of sin, may be so described even though the subjects of it sink ultimately into unconsciousness. On the other hand, the solemn contrast of this punishment with what must be an endless reward suggests an irreversible sentence. All this is confirmed by the visions, so difficult to interpret, of the Bk. of Revelation.

568. Some N.T. passages have been appealed to in proof that ALL MEN will ULTIMATELY be SAVED, and that therefore the ruin of the lost will not be final.

In 1 Cor. 15^{22}, we read that "as in Adam all die, so in Christ all will be made alive." It must be admitted that here, as always in the N.T. in reference to life beyond the grave, the word *alive* denotes a state of blessedness. (The one possible exception, Rev. 19^{20}, is easily explained as an echo of Num. 16^{33}.) But throughout 1 Cor. 15 Paul thinks only of believers, to whom he writes: so *v.*[23], also *v.*[43] which is true of them only. Moreover, to write of the lost as in any sense *in Christ*, is opposed to his whole thought and phrase. Notice that we have not here the definite term *all men* as in Rom. $5^{12, 18}$, 1 Tim. $2^{1, 4}$.

In Rom. 5^{18}, the words *all men* include, as the context implies, the whole race. But here Paul asserts, not an actual result, but only a divine purpose of mercy: whereas in *v.*[19], where the future indicative implies a foreseen result, the universal term *all men* is replaced by a less definite term, *the many*. See my *Commentary*. More definite is the great prophecy in Isa. 45^{23}, quoted in Rom. 14^{11}, which asserts that a day will come when universal homage will be paid

to God. Such homage we cannot conceive to come from any but the willing and joyous lips of the saved. A reference to the same prophecy, in the form now of a divine purpose, is found in Ph. $2^{9\text{-}11}$. That this purpose will ultimately be attained in a full and real sense, we cannot doubt; but Paul must have understood it in harmony with his own solemn assertion in ch. 3^{19}. This purpose is, in view of the whole N.T. teaching, a very uncertain foundation for an assertion that all men now living will be saved. So Eph. 1^{10}, Col. 1^{20}. In Tit. 2^{11}, the meaning is, "bringing salvation for all men:" for the Greek dative of advantage denotes only a benefit designed for all men.

569. Still more difficult is Jno. 12^{32}. We have not here the definite term *all men* as in Rom. $5^{12,\ 18}$, 1 Tim. $2^{1,\ 4}$: yet our Lord's words seem to embrace all mankind. But we cannot safely infer from them more than that from His cross will go forth influences drawing men towards Himself. In this sense we must interpret Rom. 2^{4}, "the kindness of God leadeth thee to repentance" (R.V.). For the man thus being led was (*v.*^{5}) still "impenitent" and was treasuring up for himself wrath: in other words, these influences, though real and designed by God to save him, were altogether unavailing. So are at present the saving influences in Jno. 12^{32}. Other teaching, *e.g.* ch. 15^{6}, warns us not hastily to assert that in all cases they will ultimately prevail. On the other hand, this somewhat conflicting evidence demands extreme caution in dogmatic assertions about the doom of the lost.

570. TO SUM UP. The N.T. writers agree to describe, with more or less definiteness, the doom of the lost as utter ruin including actual suffering and final exclusion from the blessedness of the saved. They do not say or suggest that their agony will ever sink into unconsciousness: nor

do they plainly and categorically assert its endless continuance. A few important passages look forward to the universal homage of a ransomed race and universe; but not in a way which implies the ultimate salvation of all men now living.

Notice how much less abundant and decisive is the above evidence than that on which rest the primary doctrines of the Gospel, *e.g.* the divinity of Christ, salvation through His death and through faith, and a new life in the Spirit of God. The historical foundations of the Gospel are immovable and broad and visible to all. The teaching of Christ and His apostles, supported as it is by evidence in the heart of man and in social life around him, affords overwhelming proof that beyond the grave exact retribution, tremendous or blessed, awaits all men. But the evidence at our disposal is insufficient for confident dogmatic assertion about the exact fate of the lost.

CHAPTER LXII

THE IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL

571. PLATO teaches frequently, and represents Socrates as teaching, that the SOUL of man is in its own nature "IMMORTAL and indestructible:" so *Phædo* pp. 105*e*–107*c*, *Rep.* bk. x. pp. 608*d*–611*b*, *Meno* p. 81, *Phædrus* pp. 245, 246. He uses such terms as ψυχὴ ἀθάνατον καὶ ἀνώλεθρον and ἀθάνατος ἡμῶν ἡ ψυχὴ καὶ οὐδέποτε ἀπόλλυται, and much similar language. His arguments leave no room for doubt that he means to assert that for good or ill every human soul

will think and feel for ever. This doctrine he uses as a moral warning. So *Phædo* p. 107*c*: "If the soul is really immortal, what care should be taken of her, not only in respect of the portion of time which is called life, but of eternity! And the danger of neglecting her from this point of view does indeed appear to be awful. If death had only been the end of all, the wicked would have had a good bargain in dying, for they would have been happily quit not only of their body but of their own evil together with their souls. But now, inasmuch as the soul is manifestly immortal, there is no release or salvation from evil except the attainment of the highest virtue and wisdom."

572. This teaching is reproduced, but on an immeasurably lower plane, in bk. i. of CICERO's *Tusculan Disputations*. He uses in §§ 11, 14, 32 the phrase *immortalitas animorum* or "immortality of souls." In § 16 he writes that "Pherecydes, a Syrian, first said that the souls of men are everlasting (*animos esse hominum sempiternos*); that his disciple Pythagoras held the same opinion; and that Plato was said to have come to Italy and there learnt the Pythagorean teaching "about the eternity of souls" (*de animorum æternitate*). In § 32 Cicero speaks of the Stoics as saying that human souls survive death, but not for ever: *aiunt manere animos, cum e corpore excesserint, sed non semper*. He accepts and indeed quotes (*e.g.* in § 23 we have a long quotation from the *Phædrus*) Plato's metaphysical arguments for the endless permanence of the human soul. But of his conspicuous and noble teaching of moral retribution beyond death, Cicero has but slight hold. He rather looks on bodily life as an evil, and death as a release from it; thus contradicting Plato. Of the moral issues involved, he seems to have thought little.

JOSEPHUS (*Wars* bk. ii. 8^{11}) reports that the Pharisees

believed that "the bodies are indeed corruptible and their substance not abiding, but that the souls continue immortal always." This teaching, he compares with that of the Greeks; and attributes similar teaching to the Essenes. So in his *Antiq.* bk. xviii. $1^{3,5}$ he says that the Pharisees believed that souls have "immortal strength;" and that the Essenes "make souls to be immortal."

573. Notice here TWO important DIFFERENCES. In the N.T., except in reference to bodily life, the words *life* and *immortality* denote always a state of BLESSING. But Plato attributes immortality to the souls even of the lost; and speaks of it as in their case a curse and not a blessing. We need not wonder that his lofty moral teaching, already accepted by the most devout of the Jewish sects and re-echoed in some measure by Cicero in the Latin tongue, passed easily and imperceptibly into the Church, and moulded its phraseology and thought about the doom of the lost; or that this important difference of phraseology passed unnoticed. It has been a source of endless confusion in Christian theology.

Another still more important difference is that in the Bible the "eternal life" promised to the righteous is never connected with any ESSENTIAL PERMANENCE of the soul. Man was created neither immortal nor mortal, but *living*: and on his obedience depended his continuance in that state: Gen. $2^{7,17}$. This is well put in Wisdom 2^{23}: "God created man for *incorruptibility*, and made him an image of His own proper being." This divine purpose, we cannot doubt, shaped the very STRUCTURE of man's intellectual and moral nature. He was planned by the Creator to love and serve God and to be a created counterpart of the immortality of God. The attainment of this destiny was conditioned by man's free choice: and clear teaching in

the N.T. implies that in some men this divine purpose will never be accomplished. But, in his deepest and final fall, man is a ruin of immortality, a ruin the more awful because of the grandeur of his original destiny. Thus, whatever he may do, his immortal destiny moulds his future lot. And this destiny includes not only endless being but endless blessedness. No other immortality except this is mentioned or suggested in the Bible: cp. Rom. 2^{7}, 1 Cor. $15^{53, 54}$, 2 Tim. 1^{10}.

574. Some have appealed to the wide-spread YEARNING for and anticipation of a LIFE BEYOND THE GRAVE which has found expression in literature ancient and modern. But the life desired is one of blessing. None wish for endless misery. Retribution beyond the grave is to many bad men an object of dread. Such anticipation, evoked by the outraged majesty of the moral sense, may fairly be taken as a foretaste of a judgment to come: and the longing for a rest beyond the grave suggests that man was created for something better than the present life. But these hopes and fears are no proof or presumption that in all cases human consciousness will continue for ever, even when it has become an unmixed evil.

Others have argued that the human soul is SIMPLE, and therefore incapable of dissolution. But who knows this? Consciousness is often interrupted by sleep or sickness. To say that God cannot finally extinguish that which is often dormant for a time, is seriously to limit the Creator's power. Certainly, He who out of unconsciousness and non-existence called into being both human consciousness and the simplest forms of matter can send them back to the non-existence from which they came. If human consciousness will in all cases continue without end, it will do so only because this is the will of God. That this is

His will, we have no proof within or without the Bible. A doctrine thus destitute of foundation must be carefully eliminated from the whole matter before us.

575. The phrase *immortality of the soul* is in modern literature used sometimes to assert, as the N.T. writers always assume and imply, often in language equivalent to plain categorical assertion, that the soul will SURVIVE DEATH; at other times to assert, as the Bible never asserts or implies, its essential and ENDLESS PERMANENCE. The infinite confusion arising from this ambiguity binds all those who use this phrase to explain clearly in what sense they use it: or rather it is a strong reason for not using a phrase so liable to be misunderstood, and envolving consequences so serious.

576. The earliest use of the above phrase by a Christian writer, known to me, is by ATHENAGORAS, an Athenian philosopher who became a Christian about 180 A.D. He writes, (*On the Resurrection* ch. 13,) that God "made man of an immortal soul and a body;" in ch. 24, of "men possessing an immortal soul and a rational judgment;" in ch. 20, of "the soul as incorruptible;" and in ch. 23, of an "immortal nature." His aim is to prove the resurrection of the body: and in this he shows much skill. His main argument is that the creative purpose of God included both soul and body; that each of these is an integral part of the man, is concerned in his actions, and therefore must share his judgment and final destiny. Some of his arguments seem to imply that the creative purpose must necessarily be accomplished; and he tells us, in ch. 25, that the end of an intelligent creature is to delight in contemplation of God. But he admits that many men fail of this end. He does not discuss the ultimate fate of the lost; or whether all will finally be saved. His one point is to prove that in the

destiny of man the body will share; thus differing from Plato, who claims immortality only for the soul.

577. TERTULLIAN accepts from Plato the doctrine before us. So *Resurrection of the Flesh* ch. 3: "Some things are known even by nature: the immortality of the soul, for instance, is held by many; the knowledge of God is possessed by all. I will use therefore the opinion of a Plato when asserting, Every soul is immortal." But, as a Christian, he rejects the theory of the uncreated pre-existence of the soul. So *On the Soul* ch. 4: "When we acknowledge that the soul originates in the breath of God, it follows that we attribute to it a beginning. This, Plato refuses, representing it as not born and not made." Also ch. 10: "It belongs to firm faith to say with Plato that the soul is simple, *i.e.* uniform in substance." So *Resurrection of the Flesh* ch. 34: "we so accept the soul's immortality as to believe it lost, not in the sense of destruction but of punishment, *i.e.* in Gehenna." Ch. 35: "If anyone supposes that the destruction of soul and flesh in Gehenna refers to an annihilation and end of both substances, as if they were to be consumed, not punished, let him remember that the fire of Gehenna is announced to be eternal, for eternal punishment, and let him recognise that eternity of killing is more to be feared than anything temporal which man could inflict." He argues (*On the Soul* ch. 14) that since the soul is simple, not composite, it cannot be dissolved or cease to be.

No one can read these two treatises of Tertullian, and compare them with earlier Christian literature, without feeling that this impulsive African, who was carried away by the folly of the Montanists, introduced into Christian literature, or gave greater prominence to, two new and lower elements, viz. the natural immortality of the soul and the endless torment

of the lost. In this last, he exults with fiendish delight: *On Public Exhibitions* ch. 30.

578. In a far different spirit, ORIGEN accepted the immortality of the soul, and from it inferred that all souls will ultimately be saved. So *First Principles* bk. 3^{13}: "It is not without reason then that he who is abandoned is abandoned to the divine judgment, and that God is long-suffering with certain sinners; but because it will be for their advantage, with respect to the immortality of the soul and the unending world, that they be not quickly brought into a state of salvation, but be conducted to it more slowly, after having experienced many evils. For as physicians who are able to cure a man quickly when they suspect that a hidden poison exists in the body, do the reverse of healing, making this more certain through their very desire to heal, deeming it better to retain the patient for a considerable time under inflammation and sickness, in order that he may recover his health more surely, rather than to appear to produce a rapid recovery, and afterwards to cause a relapse and thus that hasty cure last only for a time; in the same way God also, who knows the secret things of the heart and foresees future events, in His long-suffering permits certain events to occur, and by means of those things which happen from without extracts the secret evil, in order to cleanse him who through carelessness has received the seed of sin. . . . For God governs souls not with reference, let me say, to the fifty years of the present life, but with reference to the limitless age: for He made the thinking principle in its nature immortal and kindred to Himself: and the rational soul is not, as it is in this life, excluded from cure."

579. In the above quotations, we see TWO practical and opposite and legitimate CONSEQUENCES of the doctrine of the immortality of the soul. Tertullian inferred from it the

endless suffering of the lost: Origen inferred the ultimate salvation of all men. These inferences, each prevalent now, reveal the seriousness of the issues involved.

580. The prevalence, in the Church, of this doctrine is due probably to the immense influence of AUGUSTINE, who was familiar with Greek Philosophy, and in it gives the palm to Plato. He contradicts Plato's teaching that human souls are pre-existent and without beginning; and meets an argument that whatever had a beginning must have also an end. His whole teaching about the doom of the lost rests on the assumption that the human soul is immortal. So *City of God* bk. 13^2: "The human soul is truly affirmed to be immortal . . . because in some way it does not cease to live and feel." Also bk. 21^3: "Death will be eternal; since the soul, through not having God, will not be able to live, nor by dying, to escape the pains of the body": "*sempiterna mors erit, quando nec vivere anima poterit Deum non habendo, nec doloribus corporis carere moriendo.* So a little lower: "The soul can suffer pain and cannot die. Here is found a thing which, since it has sense of pain, is immortal." So elsewhere frequently.

581. The phrase *every soul immortal*, or its equivalent, is found, in Jewish or Christian literature, so far as I know, only in writers influenced by Greek thought, and indeed by Plato. To his influence, it was undoubtedly due. A similar belief underlies the religion of the Hindus. But the phrase is not found, in all ancient literature known to me, outside the school of Greek philosophy of which Plato is the most conspicuous representative. Certainly, the doctrine of the immortality of the soul is no part of the Gospel of Christ.

CHAPTER LXIII

THEORIES OF THE DOOM OF THE LOST

582. With the above results of our study of the N.T., we will now compare four theories prevalent more or less throughout the Christian era: viz. (1) Endless suffering of the lost, (2) Final salvation of all men, (3) Ultimate extinction of the lost, (4) Probation after death. Each theory, I shall state in what seems to me its strongest form, and support by the strongest arguments I can find; and then discuss them in the light of the N.T. teaching expounded above, and of whatever else we know about the character of God and about His administration of His kingdom.

583. (1) From the close of the 2nd cent. till recent years, the teaching prevalent in all Churches has been that the doom of the lost will be ENDLESS SUFFERING. In the N.T., they are depicted as in actual torment. No limit to their suffering is there suggested, except perhaps in the uncertain metaphor of destruction by fire. But this metaphor involves, as does other direct teaching, their final exclusion from the glory of heaven. Christ speaks of eternal fire and eternal punishment, even in contrast to the eternal life of the righteous. In the Bk. of Revelation, the smoke of the torment of those who worship the wild beast goes up for ages of ages; and the beast and false prophet are cast into a lake of fire where they will be tormented for the ages of the ages. All this has been interpreted to mean that the sufferings of the lost will have no end.

Many have used language implying that this suffering will be as bad as the excruciating BODILY AGONY caused by FIRE,

and this for endless ages. Recently, many have recoiled from the word *torment*, and have put *suffering* in its place. But in Lk. $16^{23, 24, 25, 28}$ we see a lost soul in *torment*. Moreover, it is difficult or impossible to conceive a man, in full possession of consciousness, knowing himself to be finally shut out from the City of God, in just punishment of inexcusable sin, otherwise than as in unspeakable misery.

This doctrine rests, for the more part, on the equally prevalent doctrine that all human souls will know and feel for ever. For, if so, the various N.T. statements which assert or imply the final ruin of the wicked imply also their endless suffering. The all-searching light of eternity, revealing in its reality whatever has been done on earth, will make the consciousness of the lost to be intolerable regret and shame for inexcusable and awful folly and sin. The permanence of consciousness under such circumstances can be no other than endless torment. But, as we have seen, this theory is without foundation. The only ground on which we can safely build a doctrine of the doom of the lost is the clear teaching of the Sacred Records. What do they say?

584. The O.T. does not help us. In the Epp. of Paul and the 4th Gosp, we have important teaching about the doom of the lost, implying actual suffering, but no indication of its duration. This silence is most significant. In the Synoptic Gospels we hear, seven times, weeping and gnashing of teeth: but not once are we told that this will be for ever. Against the difficult metaphor of an undying worm and unquenched fire, must be set the burnt-up branches, chaff, and weeds, than which nothing known to us comes nearer to annihilation. This apparent contradiction warns us not hastily to build important doctrine on metaphor. We have also seen that *punishment* does not necessarily imply continued consciousness. Moreover, the N.T. words rendered *eternal*

and *forever* are in the O.T. frequently used to describe the Mosaic ritual which has long ago passed away. To translate them *endless*, would make that ritual permanent. The phrase *eternal fire* is used, in the N.T., to describe that which destroyed Sodom; and similar language is used in the O.T. to describe the coming desolation of Edom.

The dramatic pictures of the Bk. of Revelation, valuable as they are to impress upon us teaching clearly stated elsewhere, are a very uncertain basis for doctrine. For it is impossible to distinguish between the essence and the drapery of the picture. The smoke of the torment goes up for ages of ages, a lasting monument of ruin: but this does not necessarily imply that the actual torment is equally lasting. The agelasting torment of the Devil, whose sin has been agelasting, is not necessarily a pattern of the fate of his victims: nor is the like punishment of the mysterious wild beast and the false prophet.

585. TO SUM UP. If the endless suffering of the lost is to be found in the Bible, it must be in Mk. $9^{43\text{-}48}$, Mt. 18^{8}, $25^{41,\ 46}$, Rev. $14^{9\text{-}11}$, 20^{10}. But, as we have seen, not one of these passages asserts or clearly implies this doctrine. Moreover, against them must be set Mt. $3^{10,\ 12}$, $13^{30,\ 40}$, Jno. 15^{6}, Heb. 6^{8}, which suggest the extinction of the wicked; and Rom. 14^{11}, Ph. 2^{10}, 1 Cor. 15^{28}, which suggest very strongly the ultimate extinction of evil.

Moreover, we find in the N.T. other passages which, taken by themselves, suggest or seem to assert, doctrines we are compelled to reject. To thousands of devout men, Rom. 8^{29}, $9^{14\text{-}23}$, Eph. $1^{4,\ 5}$, Jno. 15^{16}, have seemed to assert the doctrine of unconditional election and predestination, now almost universally repudiated. And Mt. $16^{27,\ 28}$, 24^{34} seem to assert that Christ would come to judge the world during the lifetime of some around Him. These passages are quite as

clear, in a sense we cannot accept, as are any which seem to assert the endless suffering of the lost. They warn us not to accept, especially in proof of a doctrine open to serious objection, a few texts from the Bible. For confident assertion of important doctrine, we need the clear and abundant and uncontradicted assertion of various N.T. writers.

586. Very serious reasons warn us not lightly, by accepting the theory before us, to GO BEYOND the indisputable teaching of THE BIBLE. To many godly and thoughtful men, the doom of endless suffering, involving the endless permanence of evil, has seemed irreconcilable with the love, and even the justice, of God: and some have for this reason, vindicating as they think the character of God, dismissed the theory before us as inconceivable and impossible.

This objection demands respectful consideration. For God claims, even in His punishment of sin, the approval of men: and the homage paid by our moral sense to the character and teaching of Christ, is an all-important witness to His supreme authority. Even in our interpretation of His recorded words, the cultivated moral sense of those educated in His school claims a hearing: for His severest condemnation finds meek response in every devout heart. A doctrine which, instead of gaining the homage of our moral sense, drives it into revolt, has no moral authority over us. For, amid human fallibility and error, there is in man an inborn sense of justice and of the due proportion of sin and punishment which, in all ages, has been recognised as a reflection, imperfect but real, of the justice of God. There are children of ten years old who, if told that their father had punished another child, however naughty, by burning him to death, would at once and justly repudiate the statement with indignation. Man's sense of right and wrong needs to be educated; and at best is fallible. But it is a divine tran-

script of the Law of God; and as such cannot be silenced even by quotation from the Bible: see §§ 16, 139-141.

587. In reply to the above objection, appeal has been made to the profound MYSTERY OF EVIL, which in all ages has perplexed the mind of man. But this difficulty is somewhat lessened by our observation that frequently suffering and even temptation to sin have been a means of moral discipline, and thus of benefit to those who suffer and are tempted. The theory before us involves the immensely greater difficulty of the ENDLESSNESS of SUFFERING. It implies that God will inflict on the wicked a punishment which will perpetuate evil in the form of suffering and in some sense of sin, and maintain an existence which has become an unmixed and unspeakable curse, for endless ages after His purpose of mercy has been fully accomplished. This cannot be needful, either for the lost, for whom there is no amendment, or for the saved, who cannot need, for their instruction in righteousness, an endless continuance of this painful lesson.

588. On the other hand, the consequences of sin are frequently TREMENDOUS BEYOND all human sense of the PROPORTION of sin and punishment: and we are sometimes appalled at the long continuance of these consequences. A single wrong step often blights with hopeless ruin the whole course of subsequent life: and these consequences frequently follow without any apparent compensating moral gain to the sufferer or to others; in some cases, by what seems like a mechanical sequence moving irresistibly and mercilessly forward to an inevitable doom, yet carrying with it the approval of the sinner's own conscience.

This apparently merciless sequence of sin and awful suffering often CONTRADICTS our sense of HUMANITY and JUSTICE. It thus reveals the infinite difference, amid important analogies, between the rule of God, in whose hands are all

things and to whom all things are known, and all human conceptions of justice and mercy. This difference does not remove the serious objections mentioned above; but it warns us to use utmost caution in drawing inferences, even by way of objection, touching the doom of the lost, from the character of God and His mode of administration. All that we can safely say, in view of the deep shadow which conceals from us the full consequences of sin, is that the difficulties involved in the endless suffering of the lost demand most searching examination of the EVIDENCE on which it rests: and, as we have seen, this evidence is altogether insufficient.

589. The PREVALENCE of this theory has little weight. The topic was never discussed in the great Councils. The philosophy of Plato was the noblest school of thought in the ancient world. From him, Augustine and others learnt the immortality of the soul. Read in the light of this doctrine, much in the N.T. suggests the endless torment of the lost: and this, Augustine plainly taught. He taught also, with complete confidence, (see § 357,) that unbaptized infants will be lost; also the terrible doctrine of unconditional election and predestination.

The prevalence of this theory does not throw on those who object to it the BURDEN of DISPROOF. For he who speaks in God's name is bound to prove that his teaching comes from God. Otherwise it has no authority.

590. (2) Some have asserted or suggested, with more or less confidence, that ALL MEN WILL ultimately BE SAVED. They remind us that God is our Father, the loving Father even of the prodigal son, and that no father would let his children perish if he could possibly save them; that God is able to reveal even to the most obtuse the infinite evil of sin, and to lead back to Himself those who have gone

farthest astray; that the highest aim of punishment is amendment, and that the final destruction of the lost would be the final and awful failure of the purpose and love of God. Such failure is to them inconceivable. They therefore suppose or hope that all punishment of sin is designed to lead to repentance, and that in all cases this purpose will ultimately be accomplished. This argument implies the ultimate salvation of the Devil and his angels.

591. This theory, like the foregoing, receives subtle and powerful support from the doctrine of the immortality of the soul. Thus this one doctrine supports two mutually contradictory theories. But we have found it to be an untrustworthy basis for theological inference.

In §§ 552, 557, we found in the N.T. statements implying clearly that some will be finally excluded from the family of God. If the theory before us be correct, the writers were in serious ERROR in this important matter. A theory involving an inference so unlikely cannot be tolerated for a moment unless demanded by decisive evidence. What is the evidence?

592. It is, as stated above, an appeal to the fatherly LOVE and infinite POWER of God. Such appeal at once claims our respect. Already I have admitted it in reference to the first theory. But the cases differ in an essential point. We can conceive a royal father condemning his son to death; but we cannot conceive a merciful father inflicting lifelong suffering. They differ also in that final ruin is clearly implied in the N.T., whereas endless suffering is not. To assert that all men will be ultimately saved, is to deny that God does or can commit a man's destiny to His own choice; and to limit man's free agency to a choice of a longer or shorter, a more or less painful, course of discipline. To do this, is to go far beyond any evidence before us; and, as we have seen, to contradict plain N.T. teaching.

593. Others argue that perhaps the whole purpose of God was not revealed to the N.T. writers, that behind the threatenings lies hidden in the breast of God a secret RESERVE OF MERCY even for those about whom no word of mercy was spoken by the apostles or by Christ. This suggestion, I am in no haste dogmatically to pronounce impossible. Far be it from me to limit the mercy of God. But how unsubstantial is the basis on which this hope rests! It is nothing better than man's conception of what he would do if he were in God's place. And the worthlessness of this, as a basis of expectation touching the future action of God, is proved by the fact that before our eyes in His government of the world God is ever doing and permitting what no human father or king would permit. This intangible hope of a mercy of which we find no trace in the covenant of mercy and in the record of God's infinite love lies beyond the range of practical theology.

594. (3) Others have suggested that the suffering inflicted in the great day will ultimately fade into UNCONSCIOUSNESS: and some have confidently claimed that in the N.T. this is clearly taught. They appeal to the word *destruction* frequently used there to describe the doom of the lost, and assert that it implies ultimate extinction; and to the common phrase *eternal life* which always describes a blessing reserved for the righteous. Other points in their favour are the metaphor of the burnt-up chaff, and their contention that the natural immortality of the soul has no place in the Bible.

595. But, in § 546, we have seen that DESTRUCTION does NOT necessarily involve ANNIHILATION,' but only utter ruin. If elsewhere the doom of the lost were described as extinction, it might be suitably called *destruction*: for wherever existence is worth having, extinction is utter ruin. But endless

suffering would be a still more awful ruin; and might therefore be also called destruction. We have seen (§ 556) that *life* is more than existence and that therefore the restriction of "eternal life" to the saved does not involve the extinction of others; and (§ 557) that the metaphor of burnt-up trees etc. is an insufficient basis for the doctrine before us. On the other hand, although the N.T. writers frequently assert and imply the suffering of the lost and their final exclusion from heaven, they stop short (§ 567) of asserting that their suffering will be endless: *i.e.* between theories 1 and 3 they do not pronounce decisive judgment.

596. Against the latter theory, as a mere SPECULATION, no valid objection can be brought. It would leave room for the acute suffering depicted in the N.T.; and for punishment in proportion to sin. Extinction of consciousness cannot be rejected as impossible and inconceivable. For no small part of life is passed in unconsciousness: and He who, out of non-existence, called the human soul can, if He will, send it back to the same. Nor can it be objected that extinction would be, not punishment, but relief. It would be punishment tempered with mercy. So, in a contrary direction, the actual death of Christ was deliverance from the curse of our sin: from another point of view, it was supreme self-sacrifice. That extinction is contrary to the creative purpose of God, is no difficulty. For, that purpose was primarily one of blessing; but blessing made contingent on man's obedience. Through his sin, this purpose of blessing was, in some cases, thwarted: and we have no right to say that, in spite of this failure, the subordinate part of the purpose, viz. endless existence, now become an infinite curse, must necessarily be accomplished.

That this theory is a LESS POWERFUL DETERRENT from sin than is the traditional theory, can scarcely be urged as an

objection: for it would render equal support to every exaggerated picture of material fire. Our duty is, not to invent deterrents, but to use those revealed by God. Moreover, no deterrent is effective except so far as it commands the homage of our moral sense: otherwise it is discredited and weakened.

This third theory does not lie open to the very serious objections which beset the first. It does not involve the endless persistence of evil; and it permits us to look forward to a time when from the entire universe sin and sorrow will have vanished. All this gives to it a certain attractiveness.

597. The above arguments are, nevertheless, in the absence of clear support in the Bible, and in view of the scantiness of our knowledge, an altogether INSUFFICIENT BASIS for confident belief or plausible conjecture: for there may be another alternative beyond our thought. The evidence before us is insufficient for reliable decision. Nor need we wonder. Had the ancient prophets formulated a definite theory of the glorious kingdom they dimly foresaw, how unlike it would have been to the reality! But their visions were of infinite value as a bright light in a dark place, sufficient to guide the steps of all faithful servants of God. So do Christ and the apostles teach plainly that they who reject the Gospel will perish in the darkness of endless night: and under that impenetrable gloom their fate lies hidden.

598. (4) Since many have lived and died without hearing the Gospel, others have heard it only imperfectly set forth, and many have lived in circumstances most unfavourable to morality and religion, some have suggested that for such persons, and perhaps for all, there will be a PROBATION AFTER DEATH and another offer of salvation.

Of such further probation, we have no hint in the Bible.

Of 1 Pet. 3^{19}, 4^{6}, no plausible exposition has yet been given: and, to build doctrine on obscure and casual statements, is most dangerous. On the other hand, there is little or nothing in the Bible to exclude this theory.

It was prompted by the apparent UNFAIRNESS, in many cases, of the PRESENT PROBATION. Some say that none can be condemned for rejecting the Gospel till it has been presented to them in its fulness and power; and that, since this is not done here, there must be probation beyond the grave. This implies that the only ground for condemnation will be rejection of the Gospel. But Paul teaches plainly in Rom. $2^{12\text{-}16,\ 26f}$ that some will be condemned or acquitted in the great day as they have obeyed or disobeyed the "law written in their hearts," *i.e.* the inborn moral sense. This does not contradict Rom. 3^{20}; but implies that God, who graciously accepts our faith in Christ as the condition of His favour, will also accept from others obedience to the light they had, imperfect and fragmentary though it be, as a condition of their salvation. In any case, we have here a standard other than the Gospel by which will be determined the awards of the great day. This removes all reason for expecting, for those who in their full senses reach mature life, a further probation beyond the grave.

Touching idiots and those who die in infancy, we know nothing: see § 486. Their case lies outside the scope of the Gospel; but it warns us not to contradict the possibility of a probation beyond death.

Such probation would not relieve the serious difficulties which surround the doom of the lost. For, in a further probation, some MIGHT FAIL; just as in most favourable moral surroundings some now live bad lives, and die in sin. To suggest that men will be kept under repeated probation till all bow to Christ, is but another form of universalism.

On the other hand, we have no right dogmatically to assert that in no case will there be another probation. For silence does not justify contrary assertion.

599. To SUM UP. Theories 2, 3, 4 are attempts to remove or lessen the difficulties involved in the traditional teaching of the Christian pulpit during long ages. This last goes beyond the teaching of the Bible, under the influence of a metaphysical theory which has no place there; and needlessly raises most serious difficulties. The other theories have no foundation in the Bible, or adequate support elsewhere. They are mere guesses, more or less plausible, designed to remove difficulties real or imaginary in the doom of the lost. But they differ greatly in their relation to the N.T. teaching. To this, theory 2 gives flat contradiction. Neither 1, 3, nor 4 contradicts the plain teaching of the Bible: but theory 3 avoids most serious objections to which theory 1 lies open. Theory 4 removes no serious difficulty; and is therefore, even as a speculation, of little value except as contradicting the unwarranted assertion that the fate of all men is fixed at death.

CHAPTER LXIV

PRACTICAL VALUE OF THE N.T. TEACHING ABOUT THE DOOM OF THE LOST

600. THE various N.T. writers agree to teach frequently and conspicuously that beyond the grave exact RETRIBUTION awaits everyone for all actions done in the present life; and this, not at death, but at one definite time in the future.

They also divide the human race, at the last judgment, into TWO widely-separated CLASSES. The one will be received into a glory on which falls no shadow; the other will be banished into a darkness in which we look in vain for one ray of light. Between these classes stands an impassable barrier. This dual division finds no place for many who seem to us unworthy of either blessedness or destruction. This difficulty, the N.T. does nothing to remove or mitigate. Christ promises eternal life to all who put faith in Him. But He does nothing to satisfy our curiosity about the destiny of the persons just referred to.

601. The N.T. writers describe the doom of the lost as RUIN, utter and hopeless and final. The Synoptic Gospels also represent Christ as teaching, and the Bk. of Revelation teaches in plain and awful language, that the lost will suffer acute and continuous pain. Actual SUFFERING is implied in the teaching of the 4th Gospel and of Paul that retribution will be according to works. For proportionate retribution involves degrees of punishment, and these imply consciousness: for unconsciousness is alike to all. Moreover, consciousness of endless and glorious life forfeited through our own inexcusable folly and sin involves remorse and mental anguish beyond conception. Even on earth, remorse has often been more terrible than bodily pain. To be compelled in the unsparing light of that day, to contemplate our own past sins, when all fascination of sin has worn away, and our rejection of the infinite love of God and our consequent and deserved loss of the glories of heaven, and this without room for amendment or hope of restoration, will be an undying worm and unquenchable fire. In other words, the vivid pictures in the Synoptic Gospels and in the Bk. of Revelation do but delineate a necessary inference from the entire N.T. teaching.

Of this acute suffering, the N.T. writers SEE NO END; nor

do they teach anything which logically implies, or even suggests, that it will ever end. On the other hand, they do not go so far as expressly and clearly to assert the endless permanence of these ruined and wretched ones, and the consequent endlessness of their torment. The curtain is raised for a moment, revealing the anguish of the lost; and then falls, hiding them from our view.

602. This close agreement, amid slight differences, leaves no room for doubt that the N.T. reproduces the ACTUAL TEACHING OF CHRIST. And the widespread acceptance of this or similar teaching, often in exaggerated forms, proves that it is re-echoed by the moral sense of man.

Against this evidence, we have NOTHING to set. It cannot be objected that it involves failure of the purpose of God. For His purpose in creating man was to surround the Eternal Son with created brethren who of their own free will, under temptation to do otherwise, have accepted Him as their Lord. Nor can we object on the ground of the justice of God. For, of no one case, are all the facts before us. We know not the greatness of the sins to be punished; and therefore cannot compare the sin and the punishment. The analogy of parental and royal love forbids us to say that God's love is inconsistent with severe punishment of sin, or indeed with the final exclusion of sinners from the family of God. On the other hand, the principles of human justice and the tenderness of human love warn us not to put into the threatenings of the Bible more than its words legitimately convey.

We are therefore compelled to accept this N.T. teaching as, within the limits imposed by human ignorance of the unseen future, a correct anticipation of the fate of those who persistently reject the salvation offered by Christ and persist in a path of sin.

CHAPTER LXV

THE CITY OF GOD

603. Beyond the terrible pictures of judgment in the N.T. rises ever a vision of blessing. So 1 Th. 4^{17}. Still more conspicuously, in Rev. 6^{12}–7^{17}, after the dissolution of nature and the wail of the lost, we see a great multitude who have washed their robes and now rest in God. So, in ch. $14^{1\text{-}5}$, we see and hear harpers singing a new song: and, after a tremendous vision of judgment in ch. $20^{11\text{-}15}$, in still more glorious form we see in chs. 21, 22 a new heaven and earth, the city of God, and the river of the water of life. This vision of glory, the peaceful goal of all the effort and conflict and weariness and sorrow of earth, will be the appropriate close of our study of the Gospel of Christ.

This topic presents difficulties in some respects greater than those involved in the future punishment of sin. It deals with good things unseen by mortal eye, and therefore to us inconceivable. For all our concrete thoughts are shaped by what we have seen and heard: but the matters now before us pertain to a life to come much farther beyond our thought than are the cares and joys of manhood beyond the dreams of childhood. How little the child knows of the inner life of the men and women he sees around him! Yet he knows something: and a boy's imperfect anticipations of manhood have often been a stimulus to persevering effort. So may we hope that, although we be but children looking forward to something of which we know very little, a study of the outlines of glory traced on the pages of the Bible may be to us a guide and encouragement along the narrow path which leads to life immortal.

604. The first element of the new heaven and earth which

comes into view consists of the RISEN BODIES of the saved. These must be material forms. For the sea and death and Hades gave up (Rev. 20^{13}) the dead in them. They could give up only that which was in their grasp, *i.e.* something other than spirit: for the spirits of the saved are already with God. The only meaning we can attach to this surrender is that the bodies which lay dead in the sea and the grave returned to life; or at least that the spirits of the dead were again clothed in forms analogous to our present bodies. Cp. Jno. 5^{28}. If so, these material forms must belong to the new universe then coming into being.

This use of the term *material* is not discredited by our ignorance of WHAT MATTER IS. For, whatever be their essential distinction, the contrast of mind and matter underlies all human thought and life. They are related as the inner to the outer, the higher to the lower, that which moves to that which is moved: and we cannot doubt that under this mental distinction lies objective reality. To speak of resurrection bodies of the saved, is to claim that their permanent condition will be, like human life now, dual, consisting of inner and outer, of higher and lower, these finding their unity in the controlling personality within.

This DUALITY is clearly taught in 1 Cor. $15^{35\text{-}49}$. The phrase *animal* (ψυχικόν) *body* means a body related to the *soul*, the seat of animal life. With this is contrasted a *spiritual body*, *i.e.* one related to the *spirit*, to that which man has in common with God, who (Jno. 4^{24}) is Spirit. This comparison suggests that all merely animal functions will cease, that the material forms of the glorified will be completely under control of the spirit within, a perfect organ for its self-manifestation. This, we must conceive to be the original purpose of the creation of material forms animated by spirit. A resurrection of the body is expressly asserted in Rom. 8^{11}, Ph. 3^{21}.

605. These material forms imply a material ENVIRONMENT. The prophet who saw the dead standing before God saw also a NEW HEAVEN AND EARTH, *i.e.* with the world of spirits, a new material universe. The emphatic repetition of the word *new* in Rev. $21^{1, 2, 5}$ calls attention to the recent creation of the home of the risen ones. Not into an ancient abode, but into a new house, its erection being a new era in the Kingdom of God, will the glorified children of God be received.

To depict this new and glorious creation, the prophet uses objects the most BEAUTIFUL and COSTLY on earth. He sees a city, not rising from earth, like those known to us, but coming down from heaven, of immense size, with gates of pearl, streets of gold yet transparent, and foundations of precious stones. So charming is the view that he compares it to a bride adorned for her husband. The bride is the ransomed human race: cp. Eph. 5^{27}. The pearls and precious stones and gold are but her jewels. The prophet sees a river of water of life, bright as crystal, going forth from the throne of God. On both banks of it, grows the tree of life, bearing each month a different kind of fruit, with leaves for healing of the nations. Through this vision, dim with excess of light, we see from far a splendour surpassing human thought.

606. This vision of beauty excites inquiry touching the LIFE AND JOY of the inhabitants of this city of God. This curiosity, the sacred writers have done little to gratify. One thing however is certain: EVIL will have NO PLACE there. This great deliverance was within the far-reaching view of the prophets of ancient Israel. So Isa. $35^{9, 10}$: "No lion shall be there, nor shall any beast eager for prey go up. . . . Gladness and joy, they shall obtain: and sorrow and sighing shall flee away." Also ch. 60^{20}: "Thy sun shall no more go down, and thy moon shall not withdraw itself; and

Jehovah shall be to thee an agelasting light, and the days of thy mourning shall be ended." Still more clearly in Rev. 7^{16}: "They shall hunger no more, nor thirst any more, neither shall the sun fall upon them, nor any burning heat: because the Lamb which is in the midst of the throne shall shepherd them, and shall guide them to fountains of waters of life: and God shall wipe away every tear from their eyes." Also ch. 21^{4}: "He shall wipe away every tear from their eyes: and death shall be no more; neither shall there be mourning, nor crying, nor pain, any more: for the first things have passed away."

The vast significance of this escape from all POSSIBILITY OF SUFFERING passes human thought. We are so accustomed to evil mingling with good, and sorrow with every joy, that we are grateful when joy exceeds sorrow. In our greatest joy, we are ever on our guard against reverse: and this possibility of unexpected reverse is no small diminution of our joy. The visions of the Bk. of Revelation disclose a life undimmed by sorrow or sin or shadow; a rest for the weary which nothing can for a moment disturb.

This rest need NOT SURPRISE us. For our Father in heaven is able to protect His children from all evil, and to enrich them with infinite good. The sorrow around us now is due to sin: and the origin of sin lies hidden in the mystery of human personality. But Christ came to save us from sin: and He will save from all sin all who put trust in Him. We need not wonder that those whom, by His own death on the cross, He saves from sin He will also save from all consequences of sin and restore to the full favour of God. The undimmed brightness of the eternal home of the children of God is but the outshining of His smile.

607. The word LIFE, in the frequent phrase "eternal life," suggests intelligent ACTIVITY. The adjective ETERNAL or

agelasting does not in itself (see § 548ff) imply endlessness, but only long duration reaching to the speaker's mental horizon. But the endless life and infinite resources of God forbid the thought that He will ever permit his faithful servants to sink into unconsciousness. For this would be ruin, the punishment of disobedience. But no one can suggest a reason why God should deprive of this imperishable gift those whom He has made sharers of the heritage of Christ. In other words, the nature of the case and the nature of God leave no room to doubt that their life will be ENDLESS.

This sure inference is confirmed by Lk. 1^{33}: "of His Kingdom, there will be *no end*." For continuance of the Kingdom implies continuance of its citizens. The contrast in Jno. 3^{16} implies that they who put faith in Christ will not *perish*; as they would do if their life were ever to cease. So ch. 14^{19}, "because I live, ye also shall live," implies that our life shall be as lasting as His. Also 1 Pet. 1^{4}: "an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and unfading," or more correctly, incapable of corruption, of defilement, of decay. This implies the endlessness of their joy. These passages are independent of the word *agelasting*. But further proof is needless. The endless life of God and Christ involves the endless blessedness of those whom He has ransomed that they may be the beloved Bride of His Son.

608. The only materials for further research touching this blessedness are to be found in such present pleasures as are not conditioned by the present passing order of things.

Since, as we have seen, the new heaven and earth will be material, we may infer that, then as now, MATERIAL BEAUTY will be a means of enjoyment. Our eyes are often gladdened by visible beauty, and our ears and hearts enraptured by music. May we not infer that these familiar delights are

faint but real anticipations of eternal beauty and of the songs of the redeemed? This is more than suggested by the beautiful picture of the New Jerusalem, and by the new song of the harpers which none can learn except the redeemed.

To those who know its secrets, a study of NATURE, of its marvellous and harmonious forces and developments, is an infinite delight, increasing with prolonged study. If the present passing universe is so full of instruction, may we not infer that the new heaven and earth will be still more so? In each case, the material universe is a revelation of Him who called it into being: and, just as now the devout student reads in nature the name of God, so shall we, through endless ages, with ever-increasing clearness, behold the face of God mirrored on the polished stones of the eternal city.

One of our richest joys now is loving INTERCOURSE with our fellows, especially WITH THE GREAT AND GOOD. This must be an anticipation of blessed intercourse not shadowed by parting or discord or defect. And, just as prolonged intercourse unites kindred hearts in ties ever closer and sweeter, making our friends to be our most valued possessions and greatest joy, so may we confidently expect it to be in the great family which will gather in the eternal home.

609. Lastly, above all joys will be the supreme joy of DIRECT VISION OF, and immediate personal intercourse with, CHRIST AND GOD. So Jno. 17^{24}: "I will that where I am also they may be with Me, in order that they may behold My glory." At death, the righteous go to their "home with the Lord:" 2 Cor. 5^{8}. Similarly Ph. 1^{23}, 1 Th. 4^{17}. This was apparently Paul's chief thought about the blessedness of heaven: hence his comparative indifference to other details. This beatific vision is implied in Rev. 7^{15}, 21^{3}, 22^{5}.

If intercourse with men on earth, imperfect and sinful like ourselves, yet worthy of respect, is so delightful and so elevating, if our present distant vision of Christ fills us, even amid sorrow, with joy unspeakable and glorious, words and thoughts are lost in the prospect of that nearer vision.

610. This blessedness is often represented, in various figures, as a REWARD of right-doing and of sustained effort. Like a racer, Paul was pressing forward to the prize: Ph. 3^{14}. Cp. 2 Tim. 4^{8}, Jas. 1^{12}, 1 Pet. $5^{3,4}$. It is, like the future punishment of sin, said to be in proportion to actions done in the present life: Mt. 16^{27}, Rom. 2^{6}, Lk. $19^{16\text{-}19}$, 1 Cor. 3^{8}, Rev. 22^{12}. Doubtless, of this proportionate reward, as of punishment, a chief element will be a REVELATION of the results of actions done on earth: so 1 Cor. 3^{13}. A joy unspeakable is laid up for thousands in the unveiling, in the intense light of that day, of the unexpected yet glorious and abiding results of kind words and actions and of patient effort for the spread of the Kingdom of God. And, in its own nature, this reward must be in proportion to faithful effort.

This reward and these joys must INCREASE without limit throughout an endless succession of ages. For they are derived from God, by man's knowledge of Him. Now God is infinite: and man's knowledge of God must increase through continued intercourse with Him, and through the increasing likeness to Him which continued intercourse will produce. This ever-increasing knowledge of God must more and more fill His people with unspeakable joy in God. Now progress, intellectual and moral, is one of the noblest joys on earth. But here, just as the student is gaining deeper insight into the matter of his research, his progress is arrested by death: and the beautiful moral character,

which has won the admiration and confidence of all, is removed. In the city of God, progress and the joy of progress will be as lasting as eternity, and as unlimited as the fulness of God.

611. These faint outlines delineate reality: and, if so, all else is real only so far as it bears on this SUPREME REALITY. Just as the chief significance and value of the day-dawn is that it is a herald of the day, and of childhood that it may develop into manhood, so the real meaning of life on earth is that it is the beginning of eternal life. This gives to human life a worth which cannot be overrated. In early childhood, the heir to a throne is unconscious, among his toys and nurses, of the position awaiting him. But as intelligence opens, his royal lineage and the dignity and responsibility involved in it dawn upon him; and he begins to look forward to the time when he will wield a sceptre. Only gradually do the children of God see through the disguise which veils the infinite grandeur of their inheritance. But what they already see is sufficient to evoke a hope surpassing far all earthly hopes, a hope which is itself a sure anticipation of eternal fulfilment.

612. In this City of God, so far off and yet sometimes to the eye of faith so near, we see ACCOMPLISHED the creative PURPOSE of God. Let us for a moment review the course of realisation. Before time began, it was a thought, definite and wonderful, hidden in the Eternal Mind. In the bosom of God, the earliest form of matter sprang into being. Gradually it assumed complex and more complex forms. Afterwards life appeared; and developed through successive stages, till at last reasoning man began to ask whence he came and whither he is going. During the successive ages of human history, the evolution of society made progress. Amid a

people awaiting His coming, the incarnate Son of God appeared. Under the new religious impulse given by Him, a further development of the Kingdom of God among men took place. And now, as we stand on the mount of God, this development is complete. The course of human history has run. Its solid platform has gone back into the chaos from which it sprang. But the actors remain: and in them the whole history of the past lives still in its abiding results. From the ruins of a departed universe, a new heaven and earth have risen, never to pass away, and glorious beyond our thought. This visible beauty is an appropriate manifestation of the peace and joy of the myriads who pass through those gates of pearl and crowd the streets of gold. In them and in their intelligent service and love of God and joy in God, the eternal purpose of the Creator has found its perfect REALISATION. That purpose was, touching individuals, made CONTINGENT on man's FREE ACTION. Its accomplishment has been modified, and seemed to be hindered, by man's sin. It has involved the suffering and death of the Creator Son. But to Him and to the redeemed, suffering and death are now only memories of the past. And the shadow they once cast over Him and them is now transformed into an abiding and more glorious revelation of God.

CHAPTER LXVI

RESULTS ATTAINED: THEIR RELATION TO OTHER BRANCHES OF KNOWLEDGE, AND TO RELIGION

613. IN the material world, we found footprints of an intelligent Creator: in the inborn moral sense of man, we

heard the voice of a righteous Ruler who will give back to everyone according to his works; and in the imperfection of retribution here, viewed in the light of the majesty of the moral sense, we found a clear indication of retribution beyond the grave. These results were anticipated by the best thought of the ancient world.

614. We noticed, among many religions, the unique superiority of Christianity; and we traced it to a unique religious impulse which has changed for good the entire course of human life and thought. We found also complete documentary evidence that the Author of this unique impulse claimed to be infinitely greater and nearer to God than the greatest of men or angels, and to be in a unique sense the Son of God: and we saw that this claim involves a new and complicated conception of God, a conception held firmly in all ages and nations by an immense majority of the followers of Christ. We found complete historical proof that the body of Jesus, laid dead in the grave, returned to life. This compelled us to accept this unique claim and this new conception of God, as just and true. For, whereas it is in the last degree unlikely that they who gained for Christ the homage of mankind were in serious error touching their Master, it is inconceivable and impossible that the Conqueror of death and the Light of the world misunderstood His own dignity and His relation to God. We were therefore compelled, by irresistible evidence, to recognise the Carpenter of Nazareth as the Architect of the universe, the future Judge of all men, and the eternal Companion of God. If so, His birth and life and death and resurrection are the most stupendous events in the history of mankind.

615. We found abundant documentary proof that Christ spoke frequently about a Father in heaven, the Maker and Ruler of the world; and that He asserted that beyond death

exact retribution awaits all men. This testimony, from Him who was raised from the dead, we cannot question. Thus were our own inferences, stated above, confirmed, and raised to absolute certainty, by the teaching of Christ.

Similar proof assured us that Christ proclaimed that God receives into His favour, and will hereafter receive into eternal life, in spite of their past sins, all who put faith in Christ. This good news of salvation, coming as it does from His empty grave, we dared not reject or doubt. Thus through that empty grave there shines upon us the smile of a pardoning God and the light of immortal life. By similar evidence, we traced to the various N.T. writers and through them to the lips of Christ the remarkable doctrine that our pardon comes through His violent death on the cross, and that in order to gain for us this pardon He deliberately and voluntarily laid down His life. We also learnt that God receives into His family as His children all who put faith in Christ, and will give to them His Spirit to be in them the animating principle of a new life of unreserved devotion to Christ and His Kingdom. All these doctrines, which we have traced by decisive documentary evidence to Christ, we must either accept as true or believe that the most conspicuous features of His teaching, as set forth by those who won for Him the homage of all future ages, were a complicated tissue of ERRORS. This most unlikely suggestion is removed still farther from possibility by the abundant evidence which forbids us to doubt that He was raised from the dead. These doctrines, thus attested, are definite and assured results of our theological research.

616. Notice here TWO REVELATIONS, or unveilings, of things unseen. In the material universe, in the inborn moral sense of man, and in the social life of men, we found (1) a NATURAL REVELATION of an intelligent and righteous Creator and Ruler

and of retribution beyond the grave, given by God to all men and apprehended more or less in all ages and nations: and in Christ we found (2) a SUPERNATURAL and historical REVELATION, not given actually to all men, but designed for all. The earlier universal revelation, by evoking a sense of spiritual need, is a necessary preparation for the later. For the natural revelation, in itself, cannot save; but, by awakening a sense of need which it cannot supply, it is a sure pledge of a greater revelation to follow. Thus each revelation needs the other: and their mutual dependence bears witness to their common source.

617. These results are independent of all questions touching the authorship, date, or truthfulness of the books of the N.T., except so far as these are discussed in this volume. For, in all cases, I have given proof of the trustworthiness of the ground on which I have built. Still less are they dependent on O.T. criticism. The few references made to the O.T. assume only that the documents quoted are much earlier than, and altogether independent of, the teaching of Christ. These results are also independent of all theories of any special INSPIRATION, or divine AUTHORITY, or INFALLIBILITY, of the Bible. For these I have nowhere assumed; but have used and tested the Sacred Records as we should any other literary memorials of the past.

618. At the same time, our research revealed the unique dignity of the N.T. and O.T. among all books written by men. For, to the N.T. we owe our knowledge of the teaching of Christ and our proof that He rose from the dead. Had not its books been written, or had they not survived to our day, our faith would not have the firm ground on which it now rests securely. So complete is this documentary evidence, containing all we need and nothing more, and so needful for the accomplishment of the purpose for which Christ died,

that it cannot be due to some fortunate accident. The absolute need for some such early and correct record proves that the record itself is part of the divine purpose of salvation. Thus the unique value of the revelation recorded gives unique dignity to the records. Moreover, since it was written by human hands, and since whatever God does in man He does through the agency of the Holy Spirit, we infer with confidence that to this Spirit of God we owe this accurate and sufficient record. This special guidance, which differs from all other as the N.T. differs from other books, is the INSPIRATION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

We also learnt that the OLD TESTAMENT is a substantially correct record of earlier and preparatory revelations given through Moses and the Prophets; and a true picture of the spiritual life thereby evoked. In the N.T., this is everywhere assumed. Moreover, the spiritual unity which underlies the various and very different O.T. books, and their immense superiority, as a whole, to all contemporary religious literature, reveal both the historic reality of the revelations recorded and the special inspiration of the record itself.

We now see that, although we did not bring to the Bible any preconceived opinion about its origin or authority, but examined and tested it as we should any other documents, our theological research has revealed to us its unique dignity above all other literature as a correct and divinely-given record of supernatural revelations from God to man. In other words, though we cannot appeal to the special inspiration and authority of the Bible in proof of the great facts of the Gospel, the Sacred Book contains in itself, tested by the ordinary principles of literary and historical criticism, and read in the light of the history of Christianity and of the inward experiences of Christians, complete proof of these facts; and of its own unique and divine authority.

619. To the authority of THE CHURCH, as embodied in ancient or modern creeds or formularies, or as expressed in the faith of existing communions, I have nowhere appealed. Yet apart from such authority, we have found a firm historical foundation for intelligent personal faith in Christ. At the same time, our argument has received important confirmation from the creeds, and other embodiments of the Christian faith in various ages and Churches. For these witnesses have revealed to us the SUBSTANTIAL UNANIMITY of the followers of Christ in all ages and Churches in their interpretation of the Christian documents, and in their belief touching the dignity of Christ and the Gospel He preached. This unanimity is very conspicuous in Parts iv.—viii. of this volume, in which I have expounded the theology of personal religion. The faith thus set forth has been the deep conviction of nearly all those who have done most for the moral and spiritual good of men. In this unanimity, the harmonious voice of the various sections of the universal Church has confirmed the independent results of our own research.

It has often been said that the Church is earlier than the Bible and that it gave us the Bible; and this earlier date has been appealed to in support of a special authority to interpret the Sacred Book. But we must remember that our intelligent and confident and comprehensive knowledge of the faith of the earliest followers of Christ is due altogether to the New Testament. No modern community has any other source of information, except the fragmentary teaching of the early Fathers; or consequently any special knowledge of the actual teaching of Christ. Our one source of information is open to all, in proportion as they are able correctly to interpret the Sacred Record.

620. THE GROUNDS OF THE CHRISTIAN FAITH are analogous to those on which rest our acceptance of the

generalisations of Natural Science. Some of these last, we were taught in childhood: but we hold them to-day with a conviction resting securely on the accumulating experiences of mature life, of which they are the only explanation. Similarly, the religious teaching received in childhood from parents and teachers, we hold in manhood because it is the only conceivable explanation of a multitude of phenomena known to us by direct observation. These phenomena, we found in the material world, in the inner and outer life of ourselves and others, and in the literature of the world. They accumulate day by day: and their accumulation increases the strength of the faith so remarkably confirmed. Thus, in Theology as in Natural Science, we have a well-grounded and definite assurance touching things unseen derived by strictly logical processes from, and resting upon, a multitude of matters known to us by direct observation. Theology therefore claims to be a SCIENCE. And, since it goes further than any other branch of research in explaining and unifying the various groups of phenomena and the various deductions from them, and since the matters with which it deals are the noblest which have ever engaged the thought of man, we may speak of theology as the highest PHILOSOPHY.

621. Some say that the grounds of the Christian faith lie outside the realm of KNOWLEDGE, in the domain of the imagination; and that God and the Unseen are UNKNOWABLE. In the argument of this volume, this assertion has been disproved. For, accepting only phenomena which have come under our own observation, we have reached definite and assured results, *e.g.* that beyond and above the visible universe is an invisible Creator and Ruler and Father, and beyond the present life a life to come: and we have found a path leading, in full view of its goal, to immortal life. All these

therefore are matters of knowledge. For our assurance of them rests on grounds as firm and as capable of intelligent statement as those on which rests our acceptance of the best-attested generalisations of Natural Science. But, in each case, the incompleteness of our explanation of the phenomena tells us that we tread the borderland of a vast Unknown. Yet this by no means disproves the reality or value of our knowledge, so far as it goes. Moreover, in each case, in spite of its imperfection, our knowledge is a safe guide in action, and ground of expectation. Our Theology is to us the light of life and the dawn of the Eternal Day.

622. All this receives confirmation and VERIFICATION from the moral and spiritual results which followed these intellectual gains. Our contemplation of the material world and of the doom of death written on all that lives reminded us that we also must pass away. Under the shadow of death we clung to life. Various indications of retribution beyond the grave roused in us a consciousness of personal sin, and a fear of punishment. We tried to atone for past sins by present and future obedience. But we found ourselves unable to do what our moral sense demands: and this discovery of moral inability increased our fear of punishment. We cried for deliverance.

While we lay under this deep shadow, we heard the voice of the Author of the great religious impulse which in a very real sense has saved the world. He confirmed our own moral intuitions about coming retribution, and thus increased our fear. His spotless example revealed our own moral degradation. He claimed our unreserved loyalty to Himself: but we found ourselves unable to give the service He justly demands. All this did but increase our sense of helplessness and ruin.

But Christ spoke again. He announced that God receives into His favour, in spite of their past sins, all who believe this word of pardon, receives them as His SONS, and will give to them His Spirit to be in them the divine source and guide and strength of a new life, of victory over sin and devotion to God. These glad tidings, coming as they do from one who, by resurrection from the dead, was proved to be the Son of God, we could not doubt: and in them we found the pardon and moral liberation we needed. The great Teacher and His apostles declared that this salvation was won for us by His death. In His cross, they and we saw the infinite love which moved the Father to give His Son to save man: and the love thus revealed became to us a firm ground of exultant hope and radiant joy, a joy which not even the darkest sorrows of life could dim.

623. Christ claimed, for Himself and for the advancement of His Kingdom, the unreserved devotion of those whom He saves. To this claim, the love manifested on His cross gave the force of an irresistible appeal. Moreover, His work of saving the perishing and building up, out of the ruins of lost humanity, a glorious and eternal Kingdom of God, aroused in us loyal enthusiasm. We accepted it as the one aim of our life: and this aim, thus adopted, gave to our life unity and force. Moved by compassion for the victims of sin, and by the love of Christ, to them and to us, we laid ourselves, our powers, possessions, influence, and life upon the altar already consecrated by His blood, with deep gratitude that we were permitted to join our worthless gift to His great sacrifice.

We soon found that the battle with sin was not yet over. Our inborn evil nature and the accumulated results of our past sins reasserted themselves, strove hard to regain their lost dominion, and threatened to thwart our earnest purpose.

We looked for help to Him who had promised to save; and ventured to expect it. To our joy and gratitude, an unseen Hand gave to us a deliverance we had not known before. We found ourselves protected by the impenetrable armour of God. And this victory revealed to us the immediate presence of God in Christ as our full salvation. All this, we found to be in proportion to our faith. Whenever we gave up our confidence, we fell back into bondage and sin. But, even for this sad case, provision was made: "If any one sin, we have an Advocate." Thus our whole life is an outflow of the life of God; and is conditioned by faith. While we live in faith, Christ lives in us.

624. The whole of life was now changed. The principles of morality which we had long recognised as the Law of God, but which were once only an external and constraining power, became now an inward light guiding our feet safely amid the moral perils around. It became the voice and wisdom of that Spirit of God who had breathed into us new life and power. In this changed position of the moral law, whose authority we dared not dispute when it condemned us, and whose witness we cannot doubt now that it attests the work of God in us, we find decisive verification of the Gospel which in our deep sin we dared to believe. Amid all uncertainties we say, "One thing I know, whereas I was blind, now I see."

Our environment also is changed. Our bodies, no longer a throne of sin, have become living stones of the temple of God. Our fellow-men, whose smile we once courted, and before whose frown we trembled, are now objects of Christian love and of efforts to save and bless. Our fellow-Christians are to us an abiding joy and strength. We are no longer at the mercy or mercilessness of the mysterious and irresistible forces of nature: for we have learnt that they are in the hands of our Father in heaven, and are working out His

purposes of blessing to us. Thus, in Christ we see a New Creation: the old things have passed away; they have become new. This new creation within is further confirmation of the Gospel which has saved us from bondage to the world around us.

625. This spiritual life, more precious to us than all else, we owe to the agency of others who told us the story of Christ, taught us about our Father in heaven, and led us to bow to Christ; to the organized worship and teaching of the CHURCH, and to innumerable influences which have permeated, moulded, and raised the whole thought and life of the Christian nations. All these influences are due in great measure to the activities of days gone by, reaching back to the time of Christ. In short, we have reaped a harvest sown for us in all earlier ages.

This reminds us that man is essentially a part of a social organism; and that upon this organism depends, in great part, his own well-being. In harmony with this original constitution, Christ designed His followers to be united in visible fellowship, as in mutual love, in order that the Church may be their earthly home, in which their spiritual life may be guarded and developed; and an agency for training the young in the service of Christ, saving the lost, and carrying the Gospel to all nations. As such, He placed it in close and tender relation to Himself as His flock, and body, and bride. Our loyalty to Him demands loyalty to the highest interests of every section, and every member, of the universal Church. This purpose of Christ has been in a measure attained. In all ages, amid much imperfection and sometimes deep corruption, the Church in its various communions has been the salt of the earth, a city set on a hill, and the light of the world.

626. Such are the results of our theological research. The

various indications, in the material world and in the inner life of man, of an intelligent Creator and righteous Ruler have been supplemented by personal knowledge of a Father in heaven, who so loved us that He gave His eternal Son to become Man, to die for man, and to rise from the dead, in order to rescue man from ruin and build up the rescued ones into an eternal and glorious Kingdom of God; and who day by day sends forth His Spirit to be in them the animating principle of a life like that of Christ. We have seen man, fallen under bondage to sin, now set free and restored to life-giving communion with God, to inward peace, and to harmony with his environment. And we have found the love of God manifested in Christ to be the strongest conceivable stimulus to right doing and to beneficence towards our fellows. The nations which profess the religion of Christ have a practical monopoly of all that is best on earth. These external benefits, and the infinitely greater spiritual blessings which the Gospel conveys to those who embrace it, confirm other proof that the Christian faith rests on objective reality.

627. This wonderful salvation, complete in its measure, is yet incomplete. For the servants of Christ are not yet set entirely free from the curse pronounced against sin: and the real grandeur of their position is still in great part veiled. We wait for the triumphant unveiling of the sons of God. Those living on earth are exposed to inward spiritual conflict; many of them, to the assaults of bad men, to bodily and mental pain. Others, while delivered from conflict and pain, are but fugitive spirits exiled from the world which God created to be their home. For complete victory over evil, and for final and perfect glory, we wait for the footstep of our RETURNING LORD, who will transfigure the body of our humiliation conformed to the body of His glory. For that consummation we wait.

628. And now ALL is CHANGED, and all is WELL. Life on earth is no longer a little hut in a wilderness surrounded at a short distance by impenetrable darkness. It is a lighted porch leading to our Father's house in heaven. The material world is a mirror in which we see reflected His face. And its fading beauty is a faint outshining of the eternal glory awaiting His children. Life on earth assumes now a new dignity. For actions wrought in bodies soon to crumble into dust will produce results abiding for ever. The only things transient and insignificant are weariness and hardship and pain and sorrow and tears. All that is good is abiding. Thus the Christian hope ennobles the humblest human life, and sheds lustre even on the material world.

Just as our planet lies in the bosom of the universe of stars, completely separated from them yet united to them by unseen and mysterious bonds, so human life on earth lies in the bosom of eternity, encompassed on all sides by the unseen world, completely separated from it yet linked to it in closest relationship. Some men see not or heed not the lights overhead. To them nothing is visible except the earth on which they tread or the dark and stormy waters on which their bark is tossed. These seem to them to be the only world with which they have to do. And they know not whither through the darkness they are sailing. For to them the sky is overcast. But to those who look up the clouds disperse. Other and greater and brighter worlds appear; and our earth is seen to be but a small part of one vast universe, and life on earth to be but the dim dawn of endless day. In the light of those bright worlds and of that dawning day, they press securely forward, borne on their way by the breath of heaven across the trackless waters of time towards, and in full view of, the haven of eternal rest.

APPENDIX

A CONVENIENT and cheap text of the Greek Testament is that edited by Prof. Eberhard Nestle and published at Stuttgart in 1898 by the Bible Society of Wurtemberg. It is based on the critical texts of Tischendorf, of Westcott and Hort, and others, whose peculiar readings are given at the foot of each page. A cheap and beautiful reprint of this text is published by the British and Foreign Bible Society.

The various readings of the editors mentioned in § 42 are given in Scrivener's *Editio Major* of the Greek Testament (Deighton, Bell & Co., Cambridge), a reprint of the *Received Text* with all passages changed by the editors printed in blacker type and thus arresting attention. This useful volume thus reveals the close agreement of the critical editors, and indicates the points of difference between them.

Specially useful as a guide to the meaning of words and phrases as used by the various sacred writers is the *Concordance to the Greek Testament* by Moulton and Geden, pub. by T. & T. Clark. From the same publishers we have Grimm's *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, translated by Thayer, which I heartily recommend; also Cremer's valuable *Biblico-Theological Lexicon of N.T. Greek*, of which we greatly need a translation of the latest edition.

From the same publishers also we have Dr. W. F. Moulton's admirable translation of Winer's epoch-making *Treatise on the*

Grammar of New Testament Greek; and we have promise of a new work based on the same by Dr. J. H. Moulton, of which a most interesting volume of *Prolegomena* has already appeared. An independent and very excellent work on the same subject by Dr. Fred. Blass appeared in 1896, and has been translated by Thackeray, second edition 1905 pub. by Macmillan.

For beginners in Greek and Hebrew, I recommend the Handbooks to the *Grammar of the Greek Testament* and *Old Testament Hebrew* by Dr. S. G. Green, Religious Tract Society. Very helpful to the young student of Hebrew is the *Old Testament, Hebrew and English*, published by the B. and F. Bible Society.

As concordances to the English Bible, in great part supplying the place of a Hebrew concordance to O.T., I strongly recommend those by Young (George Adam Young & Co.) and by Strong (Hodder & Stoughton).

Every theologian needs to have always at hand, for careful study, a copy of the *Septuagint*, an indispensable link between the Hebrew Old Testament and the Greek New Testament. Every student of the English Bible should have at hand, as a group of voices speaking during the interval of silence, the R.V. of *The Apocrypha*

INDEX

Aaron, 79, 251f, 360, 362
Abraham, 60, 62, 123, 152, 155, 165, 171, 315, 337, 405f, 423
Acknowledged books of New Testament, 37
Adam, 143ff, 515
Adoption, 232f
Æschylus, quoted, 495
Amos, 59
Anathema, 251
Angels, 123ff, 356
Angel of the Lord, 123f
Anglican Church, 119, 331, 369f, 373f, 395, 413, 415
Annihilation, 532
Apocrypha, 56, 254
Apollinaris, 121
Apostle, 350f
Aramaic language, 55
Archangel, 125
Aristotle, 164, 509
Arius, 117
Arminius, 328–332
Assurance, 238ff
Athenagoras, 521
Atonement, 184, 192ff
Augsburg Confession, 119, 391
Augustine, 268, 327, 435, 510, 524, 530
Authorised Version, 41
Babylon, 23, 512
Baptismal regeneration, 413
Baptist churches, 119
Barnabas, 353, 355, 428
Bezaleel, 107, 267
Birth of Christ, 103
Bishops, 353, 357ff
Blunt, quoted, 331
Body, 133, 540
Body of Christ, 85, 344ff
Bride of Christ, 85, 347f
Buddhism, 442
Budge, Dr., 442
Butler, Bishop, 13

Calvin, 326f, 331f, 393
Canon, the, 56, 67
Catholic Church, the, 362, 374
Chalcedon, Council of, 119ff
Cherubim, 124
China, 21f
Chronicles, Books of, 53f
Chronology of Old Testament, 59
Chrysippus, quoted, 8
Church history, 379
Cicero, quoted, 7, 13, 518
Circumcision, 399, 405
Clement, Epistle of, 33, 68, 357
Clement of Alex., 32, 353, 359
Colossians, Epistle to, 33

Confession, 394, 396, 412
Confirmation, 412, 420
Conscience, 136
Consecration, 266
Constantine, 435
Constantinople, Council of, 118ff
Consubstantiation, 392
Conversion, 174
Corinthians, Epistles to, 33
Councils, Ecumenical, 117ff, 316
Covenant, the New, 188, 334, 360, 375, 382, 399
Covenant, the Old, 152, 334, 360
Cranmer, 365
Creation, 6ff, 62, 263, 313f
Creator, the, 3ff, 77, 113, 208
Critical editions of New Testament, 40f
Cyprian, 360ff, 371, 402

DANIEL, Book of, 52ff
Dates of New Testament books, 34, 39
David, 55, 59, 169, 205f
Day of the Lord, 452f, 459
Deacons, 354
Dead to sin, 279
Death, 131, 139f, 143f
Death of Christ, 181ff, 277f
Decalogue, 78, 337, 423
Demons, 126, 171
Demosthenes, quoted, 13
Destruction, 494ff
Devil, the, 125f
Dion Cassius, 424
Dion Chrysostom, 495
Disputed books of New Testament, 37
Dogma, 352
Dort, Synod of, 330f

ECCLESIA, 340f
Ecclesiastes, Book of, 54, 68
Edom, 511f
Egyptians, belief of, 442
Elders of the Church, 352
Election, 312, 326
Elizabeth, Queen, 364, 367ff, 415
Ennius, quoted, 7f
Enoch, Book of, 447, 454ff
Ephesians, Epistle to, 33
Esau, 312
Essenes, 493, 519
Eternal, 498ff
Eternal life, 160, 500, 504
Euripides, quoted, 509
Eusebius, 37
Eutyches, 121
Evil, 138ff, 314f, 320, 488, 529, 541f
Evolution, 4, 223
Exodus, Book of, 54
Exodus, the, 60, 152, 315
Extreme unction, 420
Ezekiel, 58

FAITH, 159ff, 171ff, 269ff, 300
Fall of man, 142ff
Fatherhood of God, 81, 155, 234f
Filioque, 121
Finns, the, 26
Flavian, 121
Flesh, 133
Flock of Christ, 343, 347
Foreknowledge, 311f
Fourth Gospel, the, 36
France, Reformation in, 364
Freedom, 316ff

GALATIANS, Epistle to, 33
Gehenna, 506
Genesis, 54
Gentiles, 70, 83, 141, 153
German Protestants, 364, 374

German Reformation, 363f
Gnostics, the, 361
Gog, 475, 481
Gore, Bishop, quoted, 375
Gospels, the, 31, 35, 69
Greece, 23, 224
Greek aorist, 295
Greek athletic contests, 42, 289f
Greek Church, 119
Greek version of Old Testament, 55, 253, 562
Green, J. R., quoted, 378

HAGIOGRAPHA, 53
Hebrews, Epistle to, 37
Hebrew text of Old Testament, 55
Henry VIII., King, 364ff, 415
Hinduism, 442
Holiness, 249ff
Holiness of God, 79ff
Holland, Reformation in, 364
Holy of Holies, 250f
Holy Spirit, 113, 254f
Homer, quoted, 449f, 495f
Hort, F. J. A., quoted, 40
Hosea, 59
Hungarians, the, 26
Huxley, quoted, 319f

IGNATIUS, 353, 357
Immersion, 418
In Christ, 275f
India, 21
Inerrancy of the Bible, 48ff, 66f, 74, 218f, 550
Inspiration of the Bible, 50, 57, 64, 66, 550
Intercession of Christ, 303
Irenæus, 32, 37, 353, 357, 425, 509
Isaac, 312, 405f
Isaiah, 54f
Ishmael, 312
Israel, 26f, 59, 61, 70, 77, 83, 152f

JACOB, 312
James, 31, 37, 39, 246, 354, 358
Japan, 21f
Jealousy of God, 80
Jeremiah, 58, 175
Jerome, quoted, 358
Jews, the, 26f
Job, Book of, 54
John, 32, 35f, 38, 69, 219, 246, 359
John the Baptist, 259, 396, 457
Josephus, 37, 338, 493, 518f
Jude, 31, 38
Judith, Book of, 493
Justice of God, 186, 190, 195, 199
Justification, 164, 172
Justin Martyr, 35, 38, 389, 425, 428

KADESH, 253
Kahnis, quoted, 392
Kenotic theories, 106
Korah, 251, 360

LACHMANN, 40
Lamentations, Book of, 52, 54
Last Supper, 48
Law, the, 151ff, 187, 281ff, 289
Lee, Archdeacon, quoted, 67
Leo I., Bishop of Rome, 121
Life, 4f, 131ff, 225, 314, 325
Lightfoot, Bishop, quoted, 355, 356
Linus, Bishop of Rome, 357
Livy, 346
Lord's Day, 421, 427ff

Lord's Supper, 298, 380ff, 400, 414, 433
Love of God, 81f, 264
Love to God, 264, 286f
Luke, 35
Luther, 364
Lutheran Church, 391f

Maccabees, Books of, 56, 509
Macon, Council of, 435
Man, 131ff, 314f
Margin of Revised Version, 41
Mark, 35
Mary, mother of Jesus, 104, 120, 122
Mary of Magdala, 204, 219
Matrimony, 420
Matter, 287, 313, 488, 490, 540
Matthew, 35
Methodist Revival, the, 316, 331
Methodist Societies, 370
Michael, archangel, 125
Mill, J. S., quoted, 318
Millennium, 472ff, 477ff
Mind, 5, 133, 287, 488
Minister, 355
Moral Law, the, 134, 152, 156
Moral sense, the, 9ff, 77, 134ff, 151, 528
Mosaic Ritual, 260
Moses, 31, 54, 60, 79, 252, 337
Muratori, Fragment of, 32, 35, 37, 67
Mysteries, the Greek, 292
Mystery, 460, 529

Natural Science, 4ff, 22, 62, 65, 145f, 220ff, 225, 553f
Natural Theology, 16, 18, 70, 83, 155f, 549f
Necessity, 318f
Nehemiah, Book of, 53, 55
Nestorius, 121
Nicæa, Council of, 117ff, 359f

Objective Holiness, 252, 256
Old Catholics, 374
Omoousion, 118
Only-begotten, 84
Origen, 402, 523

Paraclete, 110
Parousia, 458ff, 463, 466, 474
Paul, 31, 68f, 160, 206f, 212, 215, 218, 246, 351, 355
Peace with God, 165
Penance, 420
Pentateuch, 52, 152
Pentecost, 340, 349, 465
Perry, Canon, quoted, 331f, 364ff
Persia, 21, 26
Person, 89f, 110ff, 114f, 135, 259
Peter, 31, 37f, 39, 68, 160, 205f, 246, 351
Pharisees, 493, 519
Philippians, Epistle to, 33
Philistines, 59
Philo, 54, 110, 493
Pius IV., Pope, 372
Plato, 6, 62, 286, 418, 443, 496, 517f, 530
Plutarch, 495f
Plymouth Brethren, 371
Prayer, 298ff
Predestination, 312, 326
Presbyterians, 370
Priests, 251, 255, 338, 360f
Probation after death, 534
Procession of the Spirit, 112, 121
Prophets, Books of, 52ff
Propitiation, 184f, 303
Proverbs, Book of, 53
Psalms, Book of, 53

Real Presence, 385
Reconciled to God, 165, 188f
Redemption, 183f
Reformation, the, 316, 363ff
Regeneration, 244ff, 413
Remonstrants, the, 329
Resurrection of the dead, 456, 460ff, 473ff, 540
Retribution, 14, 156, 208, 441ff
Revelation, 16, 161, 449, 459, 463, 486, 545, 549f
Revelation, Book of, 38f, 85f, 471ff, 510ff
Revised Version, 41f
Righteousness, 160ff
Ritual, Mosaic, 250, 260, 338
Roman Church, 119, 371f, 390, 394, 415
Romans, Epistle to, 33
Russia, 26
Ruth, Book of, 52, 54

Sabbath, 250f, 257, 421ff
Sacerdotalism, 360ff
Sacrament, 420
Saint, 249, 255f
Sampson, 107, 267
Samuel, 59
Sancroft, Archbishop, 370
Sanctification, 250ff, 270f
Satan, 125f, 460, 479
Scandinavia, Reformation in, 364
Scotland, Reformation in, 370
Seneca, quoted, 346
Septuagint Version, 55, 253f, 562
Sin, 80, 138ff
Sinai, 250
Sirach, the son of, 56, 493
Socrates, 12
Socrates, *Church History*, 117
Solomon, 55, 59
Son of Man, 455ff
Song of Songs, 54
Sophocles, quoted, 12, 419, 449
Soul, 133
Spencer, Herbert, 319, 487
Spirit, 108f, 131
Spirit of God, 64, 107ff, 236f, 267ff
Strabo, quoted, 252
Subjective holiness, 252, 256f
Subordination of the Son, 90
Switzerland, Reformation in, 364
Synagogue, 338f, 359
Synoptic Gospels, 35, 69, 159, 181f, 464, 505
Syriac language, 55

Temple, 257, 343, 347
Tertullian, 32, 353, 359, 360, 389, 402, 522f
Textual Criticism, 40f
Thessalonians, Epistles to, 33f
Thirty-nine Articles, 393
Timothy, 355
Timothy, Epistles to, 33f
Tischendorf, 40
Titus, 355
Titus, Epistle to, 33f
Toleration, Act of, 378
Torment, 511
Transmigration, 442
Transubstantiation, 390
Tregelles, 40
Trent, Council of, 119, 372, 390f, 394, 420
Trinity, the, 115
Trumpet, the Last, 461
Turkey, 21

Uniformity, Act of, 369
Unitarians, 119
Unity of God, 6, 77f, 93f
Universalism, 530ff

VEDAS, Indian, 62, 424
Version, Revised, 41ff
Versions, ancient, 40

WESLEY, 331f, 370
Westcott, quoted, 40
Westminster Confession, the, 119, 331
Wiedermann, quoted, 443
Williams, Monier, quoted, 442
Wisdom, Book of, 56, 68, 447, 509, 519
Witness of the Spirit, 242ff
Word of God, 65

XENOPHON, 12, 495

ZALEUCUS, 199f
Zechariah, 55
Zwingli, 393f

Printed by Hazell, Watson & Viney, Ld., London and Aylesbury.

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
CLAREMONT, CALIF.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

Commentaries on St. Paul's Epistles

1. ROMANS. *Tenth Edition.* 7*s.* 6*d.*
2. CORINTHIANS. *Seventh Edition.* 10*s.* 6*d.*
3. GALATIANS. *Fifth Edition.* 5*s.*
4. EPHESIANS, PHILIPPIANS, COLOSSIANS. *Third Edition.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

"In Dr. Agar Beet the Wesleyans have now a theologian who takes his place among the best of living expositors; and we may hope that, as the community to which he belongs is beginning to contribute its fair share to general literature, so Dr. Beet is but the first of a line of Methodist divines who shall rival those of the Presbyterians and the Independents; and shall have their weight, as he has, with the scholars of the English Church. It is no small achievement to have carried into its ninth edition a book on so well worked a theme as the Epistle to the Romans. This success is the reward of solid and sober work. The writer has the great merit of knowing his own mind, and of expressing his meaning with lucidity; and his literary skill enables him to give his readers most of the results attained by scholarship without distracting the unlearned by a parade of Greek. But he is more than a commentator; he applies the lessons of the Epistle with impressive earnestness and unfailing good taste."—*The Saturday Review.*

"This is one of the greatest extant commentaries on Romans; and it is more, for it is also a compendium of theology, as must needs be the case with a work on the Epistle that deals at all adequately with its subject. Again and again as we turn over the pages we are delighted with some happy rendering, the skilful unravelling of some knotty phrase, the keen cut of thought into the heart of some tough sentence."—*The Christian World.*

"To criticise a book of which the public has pronounced so unmistakable an appreciation is needless, and would be presumptuous. Professor Beet could himself have given no stronger proof of his esteem of the Epistle to the Romans than by his thorough revision of a commentary which in the public regard already occupied so high a place. It would have been easy to pass it unrevised into a new edition. To a busy man, as Dr. Beet is, this was a temptation. Nothing could more distinctly mark his love of truth and the devotion to exactness which possesses the true scholar than his expenditure of toil in bringing his book still nearer perfection. It was a wise course to adopt. No labour spent on a work of such importance is labour in vain."—*The British Weekly.*

LONDON: HODDER & STOUGHTON

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

THE LAST THINGS

Crown 8vo, Price Six Shillings

DR. CHADWICK, BISHOP OF DERRY AND RAPHOE

"The most sober and careful, as well as thorough and trustworthy, examination of the scriptural teaching known to me."

DR. MARCUS DODS IN THE EXPOSITOR

"A book which must be reckoned with as in certain directions distinctly advancing the discussion of this great question, and as a full, careful, and valuable examination of the relevant teaching of Scripture. All who seek for light on this theme, that concerns every individual, would do well to consult this suggestive volume."

CANON BENHAM, D.D., IN THE COURT JOURNAL

"It does one good to read words like these."

THE CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW

"It would be difficult to praise too highly the extreme care which Dr. Beet has bestowed upon the rendering and interpretation of passages of Holy Scripture throughout his work. . . . As to the future punishment of sin, Dr. Beet is so cautious in not going beyond the language of Holy Scripture, and in giving due weight to all that is there said, that he has succeeded in producing in us that impression of solemn uncertainty which the grave language of the Bible itself conveys. In conclusion, we should like to commend Dr. Beet's book as being an example of exactly the right spirit in which this subject should be discussed—extreme care, a readiness to submit everything to the teaching of the Bible, and a full acknowledgment of the mystery in which Holy Scripture leaves many branches of the whole subject."

THE RECORD

"The lectures are most thoughtful, and, as being founded on the rock of Holy Scripture alone, they have our strong commendation."

THE METHODIST RECORDER

"No writer of the most orthodox and old-fashioned of modern Churches has ever shown with more remorseless faithfulness the doom of sin, wailing out from the reluctant pages of the Bible."

THE METHODIST TIMES

"Those who have mastered the teaching of this volume will realise that it removes nearly all the objections which devout souls feel to the doctrine of future punishment."

THE SCOTSMAN

"In these days, when both topics are, it may be said, diligently eschewed in pulpit deliverances, there is some satisfaction in obtaining a deliverance upon them by a divine who is also a consummate scholar."

LONDON: HODDER & STOUGHTON

BT65 .B4
Beet, Joseph Agar, 1840-1924.
A manual of theology /

BT Beet, Joseph Agar, 1840-1924.
65 A manual of theology / by Joseph Agar Beet.
B4 -- London : Hodder and Stoughton, 1906.
xvi, 568p. ; 21cm.

Includes index.

1. Theology, Doctrinal--Introductions.
I. Title.

CCSC/mmb